

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 3, 1991

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 3, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We earnestly pray, O gracious God, that You will continue to bless each person with Your grace and mercy. On this day we particularly remember in prayer the children of our families and of our communities, whom we name in our hearts before You, that they will be nurtured and sustained and loved as they grow in years. May their knowledge of Your bountiful creation and the daily presence of Your spirit increase and multiply in their lives so they will experience the wonder of life and the wisdom of all time. Bless all families, O God, that their love for each other will be a witness to Your love for each one of us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] will please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANTOS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-83) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN RAISES HOPE FOR MIDDLE EAST TALKS

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we may—just may—be on the threshold of a significant step in the peaceful and diplomatic resolution of the Middle East conflict. King Hussein of Jordan, in an interview with a French newspaper, called for direct face-to-face negotiations with Israel.

Israeli Government officials immediately and enthusiastically responded by inviting King Hussein to direct face-to-face discussions in Jerusalem or Amman, Jordan. The ball is now in the King's court. He should accept without delay.

The King's apparent willingness to hold direct face-to-face talks should be an example for our erstwhile allies in the recent Persian Gulf war, who have thus far refused to participate in any of the discussions which Secretary Baker has so patiently attempted to set up. King Hussein's willingness to meet also puts the ball squarely in the court of Saudi Arabia, Syria, Kuwait, and the other Arab States.

ARIZONA SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN WHO DIED IN THE GULF WAR

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, during this 2 weeks between our celebration of Memorial Day and the national Desert Storm Homecoming Victory Parade on Saturday, June 8, 1991, we recognize the American heroes who served in the Persian Gulf war and who have and will return home to welcoming ceremonies across this land.

We must not, however, forget the 387 service men and women who died with honor in service to their country. Among them are five from Arizona who died during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

They will not hear the chorus of welcoming cheers; they will not see the flurry of colorful flags; they will not feel the comforting embrace of family and friends.

We honor:

Army Pvt. Dorothy Fails, 25, of Taylor, AZ. Dorothy was killed March 19, 1991, in a military traffic accident in Saudi Arabia. She served with the Arizona National Guard's 1404th Transportation Company.

Marine Pfc. Michael Noline, 20, of Peridot, AZ. Michael died January 26, 1991, in the collision of two armored vehicles near the Kuwaiti border;

Marine LCpl. Eliseo Felix, 19, of Avondale, AZ. Eliseo was killed February 2, 1991, when his convoy was hit by friendly fire cluster bombs near the Saudi-Kuwaiti border;

Marine LCpl. James Cunningham, 22, of Glendale, AZ. James was killed as he slept on November 9, 1990, when a fellow marine's rifle discharged accidentally.

Marine Sgt. Aaron Peck, 22, of Phoenix, AZ. Aaron, a radar-operations repairman, was killed by enemy fire on February 23, 1991, as United States forces swept into Kuwait from Saudi Arabia.

These five young soldiers died in service to America. As President Lincoln said, they gave "the last full measure of devotion."

We remember them. We honor them. And we pray for them and their families.

WE NEED A TOUGHER NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION POLICY

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the French Government has announced today that France is joining the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

That welcome and long overdue announcement from Paris leaves the People's Republic of China as the last major power remaining outside the international nuclear nonproliferation regime.

China's reckless nuclear proliferation policies and practices have barred it from receiving any nuclear cooperation

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

with the United States, because China has proved unwilling to meet the conditions established for such cooperation under United States law. China has been unable to provide the United States with clear and unequivocal assurances required under the Markey-Solomon amendment that it is not assisting and will not assist any non-nuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive materials and components for such devices.

China's political leaders follow Mao Tse-tung's precept that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. They will not change their ways until they find themselves staring down the barrel of America's economic gun.

It is time for the United States to stand up to ensure that we do not send the wrong signal to the Chinese, so to the rest of the world we know that these technologies are moving through China into Pakistan, into the Middle East. If we are to have credibly fought the war over in the Persian Gulf, it has to have been over a strong nuclear nonproliferation policy, if nothing else, and let the United States now stand and send a strong signal to China and to all other countries in the world that we will not tolerate that activity. We will not give most-favored-nation status to the Chinese.

UNITED STATES STANDS FIRM FOR FREEDOM

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, there is good news from Angola. It appears that that country's civil war is at long last over. In Ethiopia, the statue of Lenin and the statues to other Communist dictators are falling. In South Africa we see a greater chance for democracy than at any time in our lifetime.

We should be reminded of the Reagan doctrine which, during the last decade, had the United States supporting the Afghan freedom fighters, and now the Soviets have marched out of Afghanistan. Yes, we supported in Angola, Jonas Savimbi, and in Nicaragua we supported the Contras. Now today in Nicaragua, as these other countries, they have a democracy or a greater chance for democracy than ever before.

We stood firm and we supported those who were struggling for freedom. That is why we have been successful, because we had the courage to take on the right policies and stand besides those who were indeed fighting for freedom.

□ 1210

Today we hear that the Soviets are asking for billions of dollars worth of aid. Well, this aid, if we give it, which

is a major question, should not go to prop up the last remnants of Communist power in the Soviet Union. If we do give aid, it should be channeled to those people within the Soviet empire and to those people in Yugoslavia who are struggling for freedom.

I would suggest that my colleagues join with me in supporting the Dole-Rohrabacher bill which would channel any aid to the Soviet Union to democratic republics, rather than Communist central governments.

LET'S NOT FORGET CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we will have a very important piece of legislation on the floor tomorrow, the civil rights bill, H.R. 1, which I certainly hope will pass, and I hope eventually will be signed into law by the President.

But, even as we are speaking about that important issue, we cannot forget other important issues which are pending, one of which I will speak to briefly, and that is the question of campaign finance reform.

We in Kentucky have just gone through a major primary election for our gubernatorial candidates and for the Lieutenant Governor and other statewide candidates. One thing stands out, and that is the low voter participation. It was below 40 percent. One party had a turnout of below 30 percent.

I think what that suggests, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Kentucky, and by extension the people of the United States, are voting with their feet. They are staying away from the polls because they really do not think that politics is representative anymore.

I think that one of the several bills on campaign reform which are pending ought to pass, and I believe that will do many things. That will improve the ability people have of running for office and that will make the people of America vote in higher proportions.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, shortly this body will take up H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991. I am confident that this House will pass this critically needed legislation by an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

I rise at this point not to discuss the substance of the bill that we will debate tomorrow, but rather to make a simple appeal to the President.

I appeal to the President to abandon the effort to manipulate our racial fears and prejudices for self-serving political ends. Let there be no mistake: The only conceivable purpose of the White House characterization of the pending civil rights legislation as a "quota" bill is to raise the spectre of racial minorities seeking to gain an unfair economic advantage. In effect, the quota charge is the legislative equivalent of the Willie Horton campaign commercial—and just as irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, the President is playing with fire. Racial and ethnic tensions have intensified in cities throughout America. Our society is increasingly polarized along racial, ethnic, and economic lines. And we are beginning to see the riots and violence that are the inevitable byproduct of continued injustice. Surely if there were ever a need for our national leaders to speak honestly and forthrightly to the issue of civil rights—and to the continuing racial and gender inequities born of past discrimination—it is now.

The President knows that nothing, absolutely nothing in H.R. 1, is about quotas. Quotas are illegal. They would remain illegal under H.R. 1. The harsh but unmistakable truth is that the issue of quotas is wholly contrived and is being used as a smoke screen.

Mr. Speaker, the President should be reminding all of us not of our differences, but of what we Americans hold in common. He should be rejecting the counsel of those who would seek to manipulate racial fears and prejudices for self-serving political purposes and he should, instead, be joining with the Congress in affirming the paramount importance of the effective enforcement of our civil rights laws.

THE NEW SOVIET LOBBY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, talking about danger, the Soviet Union is hiring a Washington lobby. They are going to pay the lobby \$250,000 a month, \$3 million a year, because the Soviet Union says, "If everybody else can do it, so can we."

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union wants 250 billion dollars' worth of American aid.

Now, if that is not enough to scorch your glasnost, some White House spokesman said, "Wow, that's really a lot of money."

Yes, some real Dick Tracy over there; but the President said, "I like what I heard at the meeting."

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, was a Soviet band playing the Stars and Stripes when the Soviet Union asked for 250 billion dollars' worth of aid? We have 37 million people without health insur-

ance, 23,000 murders. We already spend \$160 billion to protect Japan and Europe from an invasion by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is not foreign affairs. This is stupidity.

PRESIDENT ONCE AGAIN SHOWS HIS TRUE COLORS, THREATENS CIVIL RIGHTS VETO

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again, this President has shown his true colors. As a candidate for the U.S. Senate, George Bush opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and now, as President, he wants to veto the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Last Saturday, his speech at West Point was the most divisive and demagogic one that any President has made on civil rights in modern times.

The President should be ashamed of himself. His speech has done more to divide and polarize the American people along the lines of sex, race, and religion than any other speech given by any President in the last 30 years.

Quota has become a code word. Along with Mr. Bush at West Point, we had Clayton Yeutter, Chairman of the Republican Party, speaking in Wisconsin, telling the American people that this bill is a quota bill, that women and minorities do not need it, and that white people do not want it. If this speech is not a reminder of the days of George Wallace and Bull Connor, what is?

A SOVIET ORWELLIAN LIE

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, George Orwell in one of his famous works said that, "love is hate, war is peace and ignorance is truth."

The chief Soviet prosecutor today issued a report which has done George Orwell proud. He has said that the Lithuanian massacre last January, Bloody Sunday, as it has become known, was not the doing of the Soviet troops. It was the doing of the Lithuanian peaceful demonstrators themselves.

Twice in the last year I have gone to Lithuania. I have spoken with the people there. I have seen the Soviet troops, tanks, and personnel carriers, that still surround that radio and TV tower.

Like many Americans, I have seen the photos, the gruesome carnage caused by those Soviet troops, including that picture of the Soviet tank running over a young Lithuanian girl.

This Soviet coverup of the Lithuanian Bloody Sunday is a bald-faced Or-

wellian lie. Ironically, it comes in the very week that Gorbachev is traveling to Oslo to deliver his Nobel Peace Prize lecture.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Mr. Gorbachev that when he is in Oslo to take up his Nobel Peace Prize, there are two honorable things that he can do: condemn this Orwellian coverup of the Lithuanian Bloody Sunday, or give his Nobel Peace Prize back.

1991 CIVIL RIGHTS/ECONOMIC RIGHTS

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said concerning the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1991, a law frankly that should have been enacted in 1990.

This civil rights measure really goes to the very core of what our society is about. I know that many citizens wonder how does this proposal affect them.

The Civil Rights Restoration Act holds up the basic proposition of equal economic opportunity for all in our Nation the fair access to employment, the basic economic opportunity that people need to attain and maintain economic well-being in our society.

We know from history, we know from statistics and from past practices that that economic opportunity for employment has not been extended in a fair or on an unbiased basis. Historically, if you are black, if you are a minority, if you are a woman, if you had disabilities, you often were subject to discriminatory practices in seeking employment. The record is replete with examples of denial of economic opportunity for such individuals in our society. The Civil Rights Restoration Act is a means of re-enacting into law the court interpretations that embrace the appropriate meaning of our civil rights laws which are the hopes and promises of our Constitution. Such statements ought to exist in practice beyond just the written words of promise in our Constitution and of course they did prior to a series of six court cases that badly undercut the meaning of important laws such as the 1964 civil rights law.

I implore my colleagues as we look at the subject this week and debate in the House to vote and overturn all six of these court cases not just the two cases that the Justice Department argued against but also those that the Reagan/Bush Justice Department argued in favor of. We need to restore our Nation's civil rights policy to the path of progress, to move forward into the 1990's, the next century, with a strong opportunity for everyone to have access to employment and economic well-being. A true economic stake in a just society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the strong civil rights restoration measure that I've cosponsored, H.R. 1, that recognizes the strong tie between civil rights and economic rights for all Americans.

□ 1220

LUKE EASTER POST OFFICE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 971) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 630 East 105th Street, Cleveland, OH, as the "Luke Easter Post Office" with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. LEAVE BANK FOR JUDICIAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RESERVES WHO WERE ACTIVATED DURING PERSIAN GULF WAR.

(a) JUDICIAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a leave bank program under which—

(1) an employee of the Judicial Branch may (during a period specified by the Director of the Administrative Office) donate any unused annual leave from the employee's annual leave account to a leave bank established by the Director.

(2) the total amount of annual leave that has been donated under paragraph (1) shall be divided equally among the annual leave account of all employees who have been members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty during the Persian Gulf conflict pursuant to an order issued under section 672(a), 672(g), 673, 673b, 674, 675, or 688 of title 10, United States Code, and who return to employment with the Judicial Branch; and

(3) such Persian Gulf conflict participants who have returned to Judicial Branch employment may use such annual leave, after it is credited to their leave accounts, in the same manner as any other annual leave to their credit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "employee" means an employee as defined in section 6301(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Administration Office shall prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of subsection (a).

Mr. McCLOSKEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to establish a leave bank program under which employees of the judicial branch may donate any of

their unused annual leave for use by Persian Gulf participants who have returned to employment with the judicial branch. This Leave Bank Program is similar to that established earlier this year for employees of the executive branch by section 361 of Public Law 102-25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill, H.R. 971, and the Senate amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4, rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after the debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

FOLLOW THROUGH ACT AND THE HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rule and pass the bill (H.R. 2312) to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Follow Through Act and the Head Start Transition Project Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2312

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE FOLLOW THROUGH ACT.

(a) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—Paragraph (5) of section 663(b) of the Follow Through Act (42 U.S.C. 9862(b)) is amended by inserting after "technical assistance" the following: "(in the case of any applicant eligible for such assistance)".

(b) PARTICIPATION IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Subsection (b) of section 669A of the Follow Through Act (42 U.S.C. 9869) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall—

"(1) consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services in the coordination of the program established under this Act with

the programs established under the Head Start Transition Project Act;

"(2) provide, to the extent practicable, for the coordinated review of applications for funds submitted under each such program; and

"(3) coordinate, to the extent practicable, the issuance of regulations governing such programs."

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT.

Section 139 of the Head Start Transition Project Act (42 U.S.C. 9855g) is amended—

(1) by striking "to enable" and all that follows through "both such programs," and

(2) by inserting after "practicable," the following:

"provide for coordinated review of applications submitted for funds available under this subtitle and applications submitted for funds available under such Act, and"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2312 makes two technical amendments to the Follow Through Act, as well as a conforming amendment to the Head Start Transition Act.

The first Follow Through amendment clarifies congressional intent in the reauthorization of that act last year.

The Department of Education has interpreted new application requirements in a manner which would restrict the number of years that an otherwise eligible school district can receive follow through grants.

This amendment makes a minor change in the law to clarify that the Follow Through Act only limits the time that a school district can receive technical assistance—not the amount of time that it can receive follow through grants.

The second follow through amendment makes a minor correction in the law related to the joint review of applications for Follow Through and Head Start transition project funds.

Last year, the House agreed in conference to a Senate provision which directed the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services to coordinate their grant review processes so that a school district can simultaneously apply for Follow Through and Head Start transition funds.

Thus far, the two departments have been unsuccessful in implementing this requirement because they have very different grant review processes and may review grants at different times of the year.

This second amendment softens the requirement directing the two departments to jointly review applications by providing that it should be done "to the extent practicable."

The third amendment makes the identical change to the joint application provisions of the Head Start Transition Project Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2312 clarifies and improves the provisions of law authorizing two important programs and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to present the views of the minority with respect to H.R. 2312. The minority members on the committee are not opposing passage of H.R. 2312 but would like to express concerns about this legislation and the Follow Through Program.

Mr. Speaker, the concern with the enactment of this legislation is that it would, in effect, continue to provide grants to programs which have been operational far beyond what could be considered a normal demonstration grant period.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Follow Through Program, until 1986, even had the word demonstration included in its title. However, at least 32 of the current 63 grantees have received funding for more than 20 years. The program needs new blood.

New grantees would benefit the program by broadening its support and diminishing the criticism that the program only benefits a select few. If Follow Through is a successful program, then the time has come to change the program to allow the broadest number of schools to participate and benefit. On the other hand, if it is not a successful program, then we should not continue to authorize it.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the program will tell you that the Follow Through Program is now a competitive grant program. This is true. However, because current grantees have had a great deal of experience in the preparation of applications, they have a distinct advantage over new applicants and generally continue to receive grant awards.

Whether or not H.R. 2312 is enacted, the Follow Through Program will continue to operate. Without this amendment, there would be a greater chance that new grantees could receive funding.

Enactment of H.R. 2312 will allow Follow Through dollars to continue to go to the same grantees. It is time for a change.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the minority are not opposing this bill, and the question which has been raised by the minority member will be under discussion by myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

GOODLING] before the reauthorization of this bill the next time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I rise in support of H.R. 2312, a bill which makes technical amendments to the Follow Through Act and the Head Start Transition Project Act.

Last year we extended the Follow Through Program through 1994. A number of program improvements were made at that time to define more clearly the activities to be funded. For example, the legislation provided that 70 percent of the funds would be used for direct services, a portion would be reserved for training and technical assistance, and some funds would be used for a national clearinghouse. To enhance program effectiveness, applicants were also required to include a training and technical assistance component in their applications. A limitation placed on the number of years for which a project could receive such technical support has apparently caused some confusion concerning overall limits on program participation.

The amendments before us today clarify that the limitation on training and technical assistance in no way limits the number of years that a project may receive funds to administer a Follow Through Program. In addition, the amendments remove the cumbersome requirement that the Department of Health and Human Services coordinate with the Department of Education in the review of grant applications for the Follow Through Program and the Head Start Transition Project. While the coordination measure seemed to be a good idea in theory, in reality it burdened the agencies involved and could delay the selection and funding of grantees needlessly.

I would like to compliment my colleague, Chairman KILDEE, for taking swift action on this measure. Representative KILDEE has been one of the most vigilant and forceful Members over the years on behalf of Follow Through. Despite the administration's repeated recommendations to discontinue Follow Through, Mr. KILDEE successfully guided legislation through the Congress last year, extending the program for another 4 years.

The Follow Through Program began in 1967, 2 years after Project Head Start. It was designed to capitalize on the gains made through Head Start by helping young poor children make a successful transition into school. Like Head Start, the Follow Through Program provides comprehensive services, including both instructional and social service components, to young children. Almost 25 years old, Follow Through embodies a common sense approach to educating our children and has achieved remarkable successes.

I urge my colleagues to approve passage of H.R. 2312 without delay.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2312, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DROPOUT DEMONSTRATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1988, AUTHORIZATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2313) to amend the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 to extend authorization of appropriations through fiscal year 1993 and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 6003(a) of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3243(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this part \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992 and 1993."

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 6004 of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3244) is amended:

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "\$1,500,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000";

(2) in subsection (c) by inserting after "value as a demonstration." the following: "Any local educational agency, educational partnership, or community-based organization that has received a grant under this Act shall be eligible for additional funds subject to the requirements under this Act.";

(3) in subparagraph (B) of subsection (f)(1) by striking "for the second such year" and inserting "in each succeeding fiscal year".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 1992.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

Section 6006(b) of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3246(b)) is amended:

(1) in paragraph (8) by striking "and";

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(9) mentoring programs; and

"(10) any other activity described in subsection (a)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly pleased to be able to bring H.R. 2313 to the House floor.

H.R. 2313 represents a bipartisan effort to address our country's overwhelming dropout crisis.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2313 extends the School Dropout Demonstration Assist-

ance Act through 1993 at authorization levels consistent with current law, and makes minor changes to the program.

There are four minor amendments to the program which are included in the bill.

The first amendment is in response to a request from the Department of Education. It raises the amount of funds reserved to conduct evaluations from \$1.5 to \$2 million.

The second amendment, included at the request of Mr. GOODLING, adds mentoring programs to the list of allowable educational activities for which funds may be used.

The third amendment simply clarifies that existing grantees are eligible to apply for additional grants.

The fourth amendment clarifies that the current second year match requirement of 25 percent applies to all succeeding years, not only the second year.

It is estimated that each class of dropouts earns \$240 billion less than high school graduates. This translates into a loss in tax revenues of over \$70 billion and does not include the human costs.

The extension of this program, will ensure a continued Federal effort to address the formidable national problem of school dropouts. It is estimated that between 600,000 and 700,000 young adults between the ages of 14 and 24 drop out of school each year. At the present time 4.3 million people between the ages of 16 and 24 are neither enrolled in high school, nor have a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Additionally, the national education goals established by the Nation's Governors lists improving on the number of students that graduate as one of its six goals. The Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act has been one of Congress' strongest tools to achieve this goal.

The Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act was authorized as part of the Hawkins-Stafford Act in 1988. The program has been reauthorized once since that time, Mr. Speaker, the current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 1991.

The subcommittee has worked with the administration to develop this legislation and I know of no objection to it.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2313, which would continue School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act through fiscal year 1993.

This program is vitally important if our country is to continue to compete in the world marketplace. Not only do we need to provide our nation's students with the best possible education,

we need to keep them in school to insure they develop the skills they will need to obtain jobs.

Students dropping out of school 20 to 30 years ago, could obtain jobs which would allow them to provide well for themselves and their families. This is no longer true. In our highly technological society, higher levels of education and training are required for students to obtain and keep jobs.

The legislation before us today would continue the current Student Dropout Demonstration Act until the reauthorization of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and secondary school improvement amendments in the 103d Congress.

When this act was originally authorized, it was to be a 1-year demonstration program and the School Dropout Prevention and Basic Skills Improvement Act was to take its place. However, funds have never been appropriated for the latter act and it is important that we have some type of program in place which addresses the school dropout problem.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the national education goals is that the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent by the year 2000. If we are to achieve this goal we must find out what school dropout prevention programs work. It is our hope that this demonstration grant program will provide us with information on successful models.

I do want to point out that we have included several amendments requested by the administration. The first would increase the amount of funding available for evaluation of the dropout program from \$1.5 to \$2 million. The second amendment clarifies that the 25-percent matching requirement applies to the third year and any succeeding year for which a grantee receives funding. Current law only spells out the 25-percent matching requirement for the second year of funding received by a grantee and we need to clarify that funding received after the second year will also be subject to the 25-percent matching requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act is an important program. I urge my colleagues to support its reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2313, legislation which reauthorizes the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988. As the original author of this legislation, the issue of school dropouts has long been of great concern to me. As you know, in my district the dropout rate looms somewhere near 50 percent for public school children. I am certain that other urban

and rural centers suffer comparably. It has been reported that 4,000 young people drop out of American schools every day. This means that for every four students who start school, one will drop out. In urban centers, the rate is as high as 6 out of 10. Also, according to the children's defense fund, at least one in three Latino youths is out of school without a diploma, and only half have even completed the ninth grade. These figures are unacceptable to me and should not be tolerated.

We know that young adults without college degrees, and especially those without high school degrees, find it hard to earn a decent living. Often we find these children later in life caught in the cycle of poverty, stuck in low-paying jobs with little if any chance of advancing. For dropouts, as well as for society, the cost of not completing school is high. For every \$1 spent on dropout prevention, \$12 can be saved in lower benefits and higher tax revenue later down the line.

Let me take this brief moment to recommend to my colleagues the series, which just began yesterday, in the Washington Post concerning the issue of dropouts. I think that we must really begin to take a closer look at what impact this desperate problem will have on our Nation if it is not seriously addressed by this Congress.

Nonetheless, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act attempts to address these issues by funding programs which seek to reduce the number of children who drop out of elementary and secondary education. The program serves fewer than 100 schools nationwide and really barely touches the tip of the iceberg in terms of the real needs on the dropout frontline. So, approving the legislation before us today is crucially important because, at this time, this program is the only Federal program exclusively addressing the dropout problem.

In closing, I want to thank my Chairmen, Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FORD, for bringing this legislation to the floor in such a timely manner. I have had great support in my efforts on dropout prevention, and I am grateful. I certainly look forward to again working with my colleagues as, I hope, we look to expand and broaden this much needed program in the next reauthorization cycle.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

□ 1230

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I just might point out that the administration supports this bill, and it is a bipartisan effort.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would concur in that. The administration worked very closely with us on this.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I rise today in support of H.R. 2313, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988. This bill addresses a problem of great significance, not only in the area of education, but also for society at large.

Statistics show that more than 550,000 students in grades 8 through 12 drop out each year. Also of concern to the committee is that there are over 4 million young adults, ages 16 to 24, without a diploma or certificate and are not in school.

The Washington Post yesterday, in a series of two articles, points out the many problems in determining accurate dropout rates. I certainly recognize, through the years, the problems in attempting to arrive at accurate dropout rates within school districts. In this connection, the Department of Education reports one of its dropout rates—that is, the cohort rate which measures what happens to a single group of students over a period of time—to be approximately 17 percent nationwide; some Members cite the dropout rates in their school districts to be as high as 50 percent. Whatever the exact percentage may be, this is a national problem which we need to resolve.

The program which is being extended today was included in the last major reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs in 1988. The program was included as a national demonstration program for 2 years. At that time, the committee had hoped that in 2 years there would be sufficient money available so that each State could receive funding in order to improve upon its own dropout rate. This hope was never realized because the States' program was never funded.

The national school dropout demonstration program as enacted includes four types of projects: Dropout prevention, reentry programs for students who previously dropped out, early intervention programs, and model systems for collecting and reporting information about dropouts.

In terms of a historical development of this program, the Congress extended this program in 1989 for 2 years. During deliberation on that extension, three amendments were added to: First, require that at least 25 percent and no more than 50 percent of the funds be granted to partnerships; second, authorize the Secretary of Education to use no more than \$1.5 million for evaluating the program; and third, require that the report on the evaluation conducted be submitted within 6 months after the end of the grant period.

The legislation we are considering today also includes several amendments: (a) Increased funds for evaluation purposes from \$1.5 to \$2 million; (b) clarification of eligibility criteria to make current grantees eligible for additional grants; (c) clarification that "mentoring programs" are allowable activities, and (d) clarification that the current 25 percent match is not only through the second year but for the duration of the grant.

While the consequences of dropping out cannot easily be separated from the effects of other problems, it is clear that dropouts often face many disadvantages in life. Among the many consequences is that adults without diplomas are less likely to be employed or to have good jobs. They earn less income and are more likely to be poor. Not only do school

dropouts fail to reach their full potential, but society as a whole suffers.

Congress should have some sound evaluations of these national demonstration programs prior to the next reauthorization in 1993, and the committee will thoroughly review this program.

I urge my colleagues to support this extension.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the reauthorization of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program.

As you know, goal 2 of the national education goals is to increase the high school graduation rate to 90 percent by the year 2000.

If we are to accomplish this goal, we need dropout prevention programs which work.

Evaluation of the most recent cycle of grants funded under the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program will begin later this year. Once the evaluation has been completed, we should have important information on successful dropout prevention programs which can then be forwarded to schools throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that we have added mentoring programs to the list of eligible activities for educational partnerships.

This provision was added at my request. It is my intent that grantees under this section of the law will provide students with job experiences as well as necessary tutoring. From their exposure to the work environment, potential dropouts would see firsthand the skills they will need to obtain a job—hopefully keeping them in school until they graduate. It is also my intent that mentors will participate in activities with at-risk students outside of the workplace, providing them with experiences and support they may not receive from other sources.

I have firsthand knowledge that these programs can be successful. My office has been the mentor of two students from D.C. public schools and has found the experience to be very rewarding.

As a result of my personal experience, I have forwarded to all the businesses in my congressional district a pamphlet produced by the Department of Labor which promotes business and community involvement in one-to-one mentoring of students. I am hopeful a large number of businesses in my district will implement mentoring programs.

I want to commend my chairman, Congressman KILDEE for his work in the reauthorization of this important program. I support the legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2313, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2313, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MICHIGAN SCENIC RIVERS ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 476) to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) The State of Michigan possesses many outstanding free-flowing rivers which with their adjacent lands have resource values of national significance, such as outstanding wildlife and fisheries, ecological and recreational values, and historic and prehistoric sites;

(2) many of these rivers have been found to be eligible for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system by the United States Forest Service while others possess outstanding values that make them eligible for wild and scenic river designation; and

(3) the conservation of these river areas and their outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values is important to the heritage of Michigan and to its tourism and outdoor recreation industry and long-term economic development.

SEC. 3. WILD, SCENIC, AND RECREATIONAL RIVER DESIGNATION.

(a) Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"() BEAR CREEK, MICHIGAN.—The 6.5-mile segment from Coates Highway to the Manistee River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"() BLACK, MICHIGAN.—The 14-mile segment from the Ottawa National Forest boundary to Lake Superior, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"() CARP, MICHIGAN.—The 27.8-mile segment from the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Lake Huron, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 2.3-mile segment from the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Forest Development Road 3458 in section 32, township 43 north, range 5 west, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 6.5-mile segment from the Forest Development Road 3458 in section 32, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Michigan State Highway 123, as a scenic river.

"(C) The 7.5-mile segment from Michigan State Highway 123 to one quarter of a mile

upstream from Forest Development Road 3119, as a wild river.

"(D) The 0.5-mile segment from one quarter of a mile upstream of Forest Development Road 3119 to one quarter mile downstream of Forest Development Road 3119, as a scenic river.

"(E) The 4.9-mile segment from one quarter of a mile downstream of Forest Development Road 3119 to McDonald Rapids, as a wild river.

"(F) The 6.1-mile segment from McDonald Rapids to Lake Huron, as a recreational river.

"() INDIAN, MICHIGAN.—The 51-mile segment from Hovey Lake to Indian Lake to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 12-mile segment from Hovey Lake to Fish Lake, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 39-mile segment from Fish Lake to Indian Lake, as a recreational river.

"() MANISTEE, MICHIGAN.—The 26-mile segment from the Michigan DNR boat ramp below Tippy Dam to the Michigan State Highway 55 bridge, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.

"() ONTONAGON, MICHIGAN.—Segments of certain tributaries, totaling 157.4 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) the 46-mile segment of the East Branch Ontonagon from its origin at Spring Lake to the Ottawa National Forest boundary in the following classes:

"(i) The 20.5-mile segment from its origin at Spring Lake to its confluence with an unnamed stream in section 30, township 48 north, range 37 west, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 25.5-mile segment from its confluence with an unnamed stream in section 30, township 48 north, range 37 west, to the Ottawa National Forest boundary, as a wild river.

"(B) The 59.4-mile segment of the Middle Branch Ontonagon, from its origin at Crooked Lake to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in the following classes:

"(i) The 20-mile segment from its origin at Crooked Lake to Burned Dam, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 8-mile segment from Burned Dam to Bond Falls Flowage, as a scenic river.

"(iii) The 8-mile segment from Bond Falls to Agate Falls, as a recreational river.

"(iv) The 6-mile segment from Agate Falls to Trout Creek, as a scenic river.

"(v) The 17.4-mile segment from Trout Creek to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, as a wild river.

"(C) The 37-mile segment of the Cisco Branch Ontonagon from its origin at Cisco Lake Dam to its confluence with Ten-Mile Creek south of Ewen in the following classes:

"(i) The 10-mile segment from the origin of Cisco Branch Ontonagon at Cisco Lake Dam to the County Road 527 crossing, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 27-mile segment from the Forest Development Road 527 crossing to the confluence of the Cisco Branch and Ten-Mile Creek, as a scenic river.

"(D) The 15-mile segment of the West Branch Ontonagon from its confluence with Cascade Falls to Victoria Reservoir, in the following classes:

"(i) The 10.5-mile segment from its confluence with Cascade Falls to its confluence with the South Branch Ontonagon, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 4.5-mile segment from its confluence with the South Branch Ontonagon to Victoria Reservoir, as a recreational river.

Notwithstanding any limitation contained in this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in land which, as of August 1, 1990, were owned by Upper Peninsula Energy Corporation, and notwithstanding any such limitation, such lands shall be retained and managed by the Secretary as part of the Ottawa National Forest, and those lands so acquired which are within the boundaries of any segment designated under this paragraph shall be retained and managed pursuant to this Act.

"() PAINT, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 51 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 6-mile segment of the main stem from the confluence of the North and South Branches Paint to the Ottawa National Forest boundary, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 17-mile segment of the North Branch Paint from its origin at Mallard Lake to its confluence with the South Branch Paint, as a recreational river.

"(C) The 28-mile segment of the South Branch Paint from its origin at Paint River Springs to its confluence with the North Branch Paint, as a recreational river.

"() PINE, MICHIGAN.—The 25-mile segment from Lincoln Bridge to the east $\frac{1}{2}$ th line of section 16, township 21 north, range 13 west, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"() PRESQUE ISLE, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 57 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 23-mile segment of the mainstream, from the confluence of the East and West Branches of Presque Isle to Minnewawa Falls, to be classified as follows:

"(i) The 17-mile segment from the confluence of the East and West Branches Presque Isle to Michigan State Highway 28, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 6-mile segment from Michigan State Highway 28, to Minnewawa Falls, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 14-mile segment of the East Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a recreational river.

"(C) The 7-mile segment of the South Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a recreational river.

"(D) The 13-mile segment of the West Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a scenic river.

"() STURGEON, HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 43.9-mile segment from the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 9 west, to Lake Michigan, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 21.7-mile segment from the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 19 west, to Forest Highway 13 as a scenic river.

"(B) The 22.2-mile segment from Forest Highway 13 to Lake Michigan as a recreational river.

"() STURGEON, OTTAWA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 25-mile segment from its entry into the Ottawa National Forest to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 16.5-mile segment from its entry into the Ottawa National Forest to Prickett Lake, as a wild river.

"(B) The 8.5-mile segment from the outlet of Prickett Lake Dam to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, as a scenic river.

"() EAST BRANCH OF THE TAHQUAMENON, MICHIGAN.—The 13.2-mile segment from its

origin in section 8, township 45 north, range 5 west, to the Hiawatha National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 10-mile segment from its origin in section 8, township 45 north, range 5 west, to the center of section 20, township 46 north, range 6 west, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 3.2-mile segment from the center of section 20, township 46 north, range 6 west, to the boundary of the Hiawatha National Forest, as a wild river.

"() WHITEFISH, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 33.6 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 11.1-mile segment of the mainstream from its confluence with the East and West Branches of the Whitefish to Lake Michigan in the following classes:

"(i) The 9-mile segment from its confluence with the East and West Branches of the Whitefish to the center of section 16, township 41 north, range 21 west, as a scenic river.

"(ii) The 2.1-mile segment from the center of section 16, township 41 north, range 21 west, to Lake Michigan, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 15-mile segment of the East Branch Whitefish from the crossing of County Road 003 in section 6, township 44 north, range 20 west, to its confluence with the West Branch Whitefish, as a scenic river.

"(C) The 7.5-mile segment of the West Branch Whitefish from County Road 444 to its confluence with the East Branch Whitefish, as a scenic river.

"() YELLOW DOG, MICHIGAN.—The 4-mile segment from its origin at the outlet of Bulldog Lake Dam to the boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

"() BRULE, MICHIGAN AND WISCONSIN.—The 33-mile segment from the Brule Lake in the northwest quarter of section 15, township 41 north, range 13 east, to the National Forest boundary at the southeast quarter of section 31, township 41 north, range 17 east, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river."

SEC. 4. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDIES.

(a) STUDY RIVERS.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"() CARP, MICHIGAN.—The 7.6 mile segment from its origin at the confluence of the outlets of Frenchman Lake and Carp Lake in section 26, township 44 north, range 6 west, to the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west.

"() LITTLE MANISTEE, MICHIGAN.—The 42-mile segment within the Huron-Manistee National Forest.

"() WHITE, MICHIGAN.—The 75.4-mile segment within the Huron-Manistee National Forest as follows:

"(A) The 30.8-mile segment of the main stem from U.S. 31 to the Huron-Manistee National Forest boundary at the north line of section 2, township 13 north, range 15 west, 1.5 miles southwest of Hesperia.

"(B) The 18.9-mile segment of the South Branch White from the Huron-Manistee National Forest boundary east of Hesperia at the west line of section 22, township 14 north, range 14 west, to Echo Drive, section 6, township 13 north, range 12 west.

"(C) The 25.7-mile segment of the North Branch White from its confluence with the South Branch White in section 25, township

13 north, range 16 west, to McLaren Lake in section 11, township 14 north, range 15 west.

() ONTONAGON, MICHIGAN.—The 32-mile segment of the Ontonagon as follows:

"(A) The 12-mile segment of the West Branch from the Michigan State Highway 28 crossing to Cascade Falls.

"(B) The 20-mile segment of the South Branch from the confluence of the Cisco Branch and Tenmile Creek to the confluence with the West Branch Ontonagon.

() PAINT, MICHIGAN.—The 70-mile segment as follows:

"(A) 34 miles of the mainstream beginning at the eastern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in section 1, township 44 north, range 35 west, to the city of Crystal Falls.

"(B) 15 miles of the mainstream of the Net River from its confluence with the east and west branches to its confluence with the mainstream of the Paint River.

"(C) 15 miles of the east branch of the Net River from its source in section 8, township 47 north, range 32 west, to its confluence with the mainstream of the Net River in section 24, township 46 north, range 34 west.

"(D) 14 miles of the west branch of the Net River from its source in section 35, township 48 north, range 34 west, to its confluence with the mainstream of the Net River in section 24, township 46 north, range 34 west.

() PRESQUE ISLE, MICHIGAN.—The 13-mile segment of the mainstream from Minnewawa Falls to Lake Superior.

() STURGEON, OTTAWA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 36-mile segment of the mainstream from the source at Wagner Lake in section 13, township 49 north, range 31 west, to the eastern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in section 12, township 48 north, range 35 west.

() STURGEON, HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 18.1-mile segment from Sixteen Mile Lake to the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 19 west.

() TAHQUAMENON, MICHIGAN.—The 103.5-mile segment as follows—

"(A) the 90-mile segment of the mainstream beginning at the source in section 21, township 47 north, range 12 west, to the mouth at Whitefish Bay; and

"(B) the 13.5-mile segment of the east branch from the western boundary of the Hiawatha National Forest in section 19, township 46 north, range 6 west, to its confluence with the mainstream.

() WHITEFISH, MICHIGAN.—The 26-mile segment of the West Branch Whitefish from its source in section 26, township 46 north, range 23 west, to County Road 444."

(b) STUDY PROVISIONS.—Section 5(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) The study of segments of the Carp, Little Manistee, White, Paint, Presque Isle, Ontonagon, Sturgeon (Hiawatha), Sturgeon (Ottawa), Whitefish, and Tahquamenon Rivers in Michigan under subsection (a) shall be completed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the report submitted thereon not later than at the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph. For purposes of such river studies, the Secretary shall consult with each River Study Committee authorized under section 5 of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1990, and shall encourage public participation and involvement through hearings, workshops, and such other means as are necessary to be effective."

SEC. 5. RIVER STUDY COMMITTEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.—At the earliest practicable date following the

date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), in consultation with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, shall establish for each river identified in section 4 a River Study Committee (hereinafter in this section referred to as "Committee"). Membership on each Committee shall consist of members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members appointed by the appropriate Secretary.

(2) Two members appointed by the Secretary from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan from the Department of Natural Resources.

(3) Two members appointed by the Secretary from among representatives of local or State conservation and environmental groups.

(4) One member appointed by the Secretary from among representatives of each of the towns included in the study area.

(5) Two members appointed by the Secretary from commercial timber interests in the State of Michigan.

(6) One nonvoting member who shall be an employee of the Forest Service.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—(1) A vacancy in a Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) The Chair of a Committee shall be elected by the members of the Committee.

(3) The members of the Committee who are not full-time officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall provide such technical and financial assistance to each such committee as the Secretary deems necessary.

(d) STATE AND LOCAL SERVICES.—Each such committee may accept services and other assistance from State and local governments.

(e) STUDY PROCESS.—Each river study committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report to Congress required by section 4 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1275(a)) for the rivers specified in section 4 of this Act.

(f) TERMINATION.—Each such committee shall terminate upon submission of the report to Congress referred to in subsection (e) for the river concerned.

SEC. 6. MISCELLANEOUS.

(a) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—Consistent with section 13(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271–1287), nothing in this Act shall be construed to enlarge, diminish, or modify the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Michigan with respect to fish and wildlife, including hunting, fishing, and trapping on any lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to this Act.

(b) SEA LAMPREY CONTROL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the installation and operation of facilities or other activities within or outside the boundaries of those river segments designated by this Act for the control of the lamprey eel shall be permitted subject to such restrictions and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe for the protection of water quality and other values of the river, including the wild and scenic characteristics of the river: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall determine in the river management plan for each such designated river that such facilities or activities are necessary for control of the lamprey eel.

(c) ACCESS.—The Secretary shall maintain traditional public access to the river segments designated by this Act, except that the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, shall provide in the river management plan for each designated river segment for maintenance, closure, relocation, stabilization, improvements, or other appropriate adjustments as may be necessary for the management of such river segments.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as enlarging, diminishing, or modifying the limitations on the acquisition of lands within a designated river segment contained in section 6(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271(b)).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the principal sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act will designate 15 rivers, covering 554 miles, as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

This bill will double the number of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System east of the Mississippi River.

The bill also calls for the study of nine rivers for possible inclusion into the system.

All of the rivers in this bill are within the boundaries of Michigan's three national forests.

The Forest Service has studied all of these rivers and have found them all to be eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

That is why the Forest Service supports this bill, with a few minor changes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly address two issues that have been raised about this bill.

First, several people have expressed deep concerns over the ability to build a bridge across the Brule River which straddles the Michigan and Wisconsin borders.

At my request, the subcommittee has added report language that states that

such a bridge would be permissible under the National Wild and Scenic Act, particularly since the Brule River is classified as a recreational river, which means it qualifies for such construction projects.

Second, I have been working with the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Michigan, and several national fishing groups to draft report language concerning the construction of structural and nonstructural fish habitat projects, and the ability to repair riverbanks that have suffered ecological degradation due to past human activity.

I am pleased that we were able to reach an agreement on this most important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Great Lakes are the economic ace in the hole for the Midwest region.

With 95 percent of our Nation's fresh water located in the Great Lakes, it is vitally important that we protect these truly remarkable resources.

It is equally important that we protect the rivers and tributaries that feed into the Great Lakes, rivers that enhance the fish habitat and water quality of the lakes.

That is why this legislation is so important.

Most of the rivers in the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act do indeed flow into the Great Lakes.

This legislation will ensure that no dams or other water diversion projects will adversely impact the free-flowing nature of the rivers.

This bill also ensures that water quality will be maintained, it ensures that a sound management plan will be developed to protect the river corridor, and most importantly, this bill ensures these rivers will be around for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this bill enjoys the support of the majority of the Michigan congressional delegation, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, as well as many national and State conservation groups.

We must be careful custodians of our Nation's natural resources.

And with the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act, we provide a framework for Federal and local officials, to work with public groups and private landowners, to develop a management plan to maintain these rivers.

I urge my colleagues to join me, and a majority of the Michigan congressional delegation, in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the House Interior Committee is once again bringing to the floor a wild and scenic rivers bill that is strongly opposed by the Members whose district is principally affected.

If memory serves me right, we had a very similar situation before us several

weeks ago with the Niobrara River where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] was the victim. Needless to say, I believe our committee system must make a better attempt at reaching a consensus rather than bring bills like these to the floor prematurely.

I would like to correct some fundamental misconceptions about H.R. 476. Although proponents claim this bill is needed to prevent imminent development of these rivers, this is not the case. At the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands' hearing on this bill, the Forest Service witnesses were not able to identify any threats to these rivers. This should not be surprising since the Upper Peninsula of Michigan has consistently lost population since the Second World War. It is an economically depressed area that is hundreds of miles from major metropolitan areas.

Another common assertion by supporters of H.R. 476 is that most of these rivers are on Federal land so that impacts for private landowners are minimal. According to Forest Service statistics, 30 percent of the lands in the proposed river corridors—or 45,000 acres—are private property. Even though most of these rivers have over 50-percent public ownership, thereby preventing condemnation through fee acquisition, the Federal Government still has unlimited authority to condemn through scenic easements. In fact, the mere threat of condemnation through scenic easement effectively results in Federal land use planning of private property along every river corridor in this bill.

Finally, we are told that since the rivers included in this bill are already managed in as wild and scenic under existing forest plans, there is little or no reason for concern among local citizens. We should remember that the Ottawa Forest plan was appealed partially because of its inclusion of the Ontonagon River as an area to be managed as a wild and scenic river. This appeal was supported by the boards of commissioners of all four counties surrounding the Ottawa National Forest and ultimately was decided in Washington, DC. This controversial river is included in H.R. 476.

Mr. Speaker, the three witnesses from local government that testified against this bill in April had an alternative to Federal designation. They told the subcommittee about the formation of the Great Lakes Resource Watch—a coalition of sportsmen, local government, private landowners, and organized labor—which is currently developing a river protection plan on the local level that will prevent the need for costly and controversial legislation at the Federal level. All these folks requested from the committee was a 1-year delay in passing H.R. 476 so they could have an opportunity to complete their plan and report back to the

Michigan congressional delegation and the committee. Unfortunately, our action today will go a long way toward making their grassroots solution impossible.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD resolutions from the Marquette County Labor Council and the Upper Peninsular Building & Construction Trades Council endorsing a local solution to this issue, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MARQUETTE COUNTY
LABOR COUNCIL AFL-CIO

LOCAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

Whereas the Federal Legislation known as the Michigan Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 has been opposed by many U.P. County Commissions and has created controversy and discontent with the federal process; and,

Whereas an association of county commissions and boards, township governments, and a broad spectrum of outdoor recreation, tourism, organized labor, and business interests are in the process of proposing a local initiative to plan and manage Upper Peninsula of Michigan rivers, lands and streams; and,

Whereas this local initiative process has been tried, tested and proven effective in other locations of the country, and been given support by federal, state, and local parties as a successful alternative which preserves local input and local prerogatives; and,

Whereas the Marquette County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, on behalf of itself and its six thousand (6,000) affiliated membership in Marquette County, believes that interlocal leadership, such as that proposed for river planning and management, is preferable to that of federal or state alternatives; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Marquette County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, fully supports the local alternative for river and land use planning and management, and will actively participate in this process; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that this labor council calls on the Marquette County Board of Commissioners to also endorse and support by resolution those efforts to bring about a process for local river and land use planning and management.

Approved on February 21, 1991.

RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER PENINSULA
BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL
LOCAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

Whereas the Federal Legislation known as the Michigan Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 has been opposed by many U.P. County Commissions and has created controversy and discontent with the federal process; and,

Whereas an association of county commissions and boards, township governments, and a broad spectrum of outdoor recreation, tourism, organized labor, and business interests are in the process of proposing a local initiative to plan and manage Upper Peninsula of Michigan rivers, lands and streams; and,

Whereas this local initiative process has been tried, tested and proven effective in other locations of the country, and been given support by federal, state, and local parties as a successful alternative which preserves local input and local prerogatives; and,

Whereas the Upper Peninsula Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO, on

behalf of itself and its four thousand (4,000) affiliated membership in Marquette County, believes that interlocal leadership, such as that proposed for river planning and management, is preferable to that of federal or state alternatives; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the U.P. Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO, fully supports the local alternative for river and land use planning and management, and will actively participate in this process; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that this council calls on the Upper Peninsula County Boards of Commissioners to also endorse and support by resolution those efforts to bring about a process for local river and land use planning and management.

Approved on March 6, 1991.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this measure was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and it is cosponsored by the majority of the members of the Michigan delegation. It is a good bill.

The bill, as amended, designates 15 rivers totaling 568 miles in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System and provides for a study of 10 other river segments totaling 432 miles as potential additions. So the fact is that it affects almost 1,000 miles of river in Michigan.

The State of Michigan possesses, of course, a large and significant network of rivers and streams. Many of these rivers are located within national forests in the State. As part of the national forest planning process, these rivers were reviewed over the past decade to determine their eligibility for wild and scenic river status. And as a result of this review process, a significant number of rivers were found eligible and suitable for wild and scenic designation. It was on this basis that the measure before us was developed and introduced.

H.R. 476, as introduced, is identical to the bill which passed the House by voice vote last September. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs expended considerable time and effort in providing for public input in this legislation and its predecessor in the last Congress. The committee has held a total of three hearings on the legislation in the past year, including the field hearing in Marquette, MI, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] alluded to. There is also a long public record on these rivers. We received testimony from numerous groups, individuals and organizations on the preservation and use of the nationally significant resource values found in these rivers.

The legislation is supported by the Bush administration, the National Forest Service, the State of Michigan, and the major sports and conservation groups in the State, and they are significant in size and diversity. As a result of a long and extensive review process, the bill before the House today

is, I believe, responsive to the resource needs of these rivers and to the legitimate interests of the upper peninsula region of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Forest Service is currently managing these rivers for wild and scenic values, so that designation would not substantially change current management practices. It will, though, give legislative standing to those practices and thus enhance the preservation and use of these nationally significant rivers on a more lasting basis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this measure, as amended, will contribute to a sound public policy for rivers located within the national forests in upper Michigan. I support its adoption, and I recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, 12 of the 15 rivers slated for immediate designation in this bill are in my congressional district and I do not support this legislation. From my constituents—from the people who live and work on or near these rivers—this bill has very little support. Their opposition has been overwhelming to say the least.

While the bill is highly unpopular in my district, the people of northern Michigan realize that it is very popular in Congress. They understand that passage is inevitable. They also understand the intent of the legislation and they, too, believe that these beautiful, pristine rivers should not be destroyed or drastically altered.

This bill will affect my constituents more severely than any other segment of the population. My opposition to this bill is rooted in the lack of consideration my constituents have been given since this bill's conception. Their input was not requested until the bill was ready for introduction. And although some changes have been made, northern Michigan residents would like a chance to outline for Congress their ideas for managing the rivers.

Northern Michigan residents believe they can manage the rivers properly while being sensitive to the needs of the community—a combination essential in my economically troubled district. These people have lived and worked in the Upper Peninsula for generations. They too love the land and the rivers. They understand the need to keep the community alive and the importance of a balance between preservation and community progress.

My constituents have asked for a 2-year hold on this bill so that they can put together a management plan for these rivers. After 2 years of planning, they would present their local option to Congress. Congress would then decide whether the local plan is acceptable, or whether Congress should go ahead with legislation.

The requests of my constituents went barely noticed. They were told that the legislation has been under consideration for some time now and that Congress is looking to move forward on it. They were told that Congress does not want to wait a year or two to implement this legislation.

My constituents are not asking for anything unreasonable. They are asking for a chance to present their ideas to Congress. And we don't

have time for that? Since when do we keep participation in this democracy to the barest minimum. I cannot tell you the frustration my constituents feel with the legislative process at this point.

I ask, as I have before, what is the hurry with this bill? There is no mad rush to dam or build condos on those rivers now. My constituents have obviously been good stewards of those rivers for hundreds of years. Had they not, there would be no Michigan scenic rivers bill.

The residents of northern Michigan and I realize that this bill is slated for easy passage today. I am not alone in my frustration with this body's failure to accept the best solution because we are in a hurry or because it is easier to just push forward with what we began. Politics is the art of compromise—my constituents have offered a workable, reasonable compromise. By not accepting it, we have passed up the perfect solution to this controversial bill. When this bill goes to the Senate, it is essential that changes are made to reflect the needs of northern Michigan. Those changes then must be supported by the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer my support to the passage of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act. This legislation is a tribute to the beauty of Michigan's rivers and to the commitment among the Michigan Congressional delegation that we need to act now to preserve some of our most precious resources. This bill establishes a strong Federal role in the custodianship and protection of Michigan's rivers.

The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act is critical for Michigan. Many of Michigan's cherished national forests and scenic areas are feeling the strain of increased development. This bill will permanently set aside fifteen Michigan rivers from environmentally unsound development and exploitation. These fourteen rivers, covering 634 miles, are all within the boundaries of the Huron-Manistee, the Hiawatha, and the Ottawa National Forests.

In Michigan, our rivers play a vital role in our environment. Our great forests and our abundant fish and wildlife rely on Michigan's rivers for their survival. The people of Michigan and tourists from all over the country use these rivers for their recreation and their enjoyment. This legislation will ensure that these rivers will be used in an ecologically responsible manner for many generations to come.

The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act is the right answer to dealing with the increased strain on our natural resources. Including these fifteen rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System will require the Forest Service to develop long-term plans for the sound management of their watersheds. In accordance with these long-term plans, this legislation will also prevent the damming or diversion of these rivers.

My colleague from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, deserves a great deal of credit for drafting this landmark legislation and for again working for its passage in the 102d Congress. In addition to having an exemplary record on protecting our environment and natural resources, Mr. KILDEE also knows these rivers well—he has canoed almost all of them and has long recognized their beauty and the need to preserve them in their current unspoiled state.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act and I look forward to its swift passage by the House of Representatives. The passage of this legislation will make great strides toward setting aside and managing Michigan's most vital wilderness areas for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 476, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 990) to authorize additional appropriations for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield, MD, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION.

There are authorized to be appropriated up to \$20,000,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland; such sums shall be in addition to other funds available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 990, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at Monocacy Junction two major roads, as well as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, came together. On July 9, 1864, the Union and Confederate Armies met at the Battle of

Monocacy. While the Confederates defeated the Union, the Union forces succeeded in delaying the Confederate advance on Washington, DC, for a single day—sufficient time for reinforcements to arrive to protect the Nation's Capital. After the Battle of Monocacy, the Confederates proceeded toward Washington, DC, arriving there the next day at Fort Stevers. Reinforced Union forces drove the Confederates back to Virginia. The Capital City was not again so threatened by the Confederacy.

H.R. 990, introduced by our colleague, Congresswoman BEVERLY BYRON, will protect a key part of the Battle of Monocacy by increasing the authorized land acquisition ceiling at Monocacy National Battlefield. Doing so will allow the National Park Service to purchase the Trail-Mathias Farm, a historic farm located inside the park's boundary. The farm, located next to an industrial park, is threatened with development if it is not made part of the park in the near future.

In testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the administration and public witnesses testified in favor of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I also endorse this legislation and look forward to its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of actions on behalf of this body to support the acquisition of key tracts of land at Monocacy National Battlefield. There is little doubt that acquisition of the two large farms, where most of the fighting in this battle to prevent the Confederates from capturing the Capital took place, is key to interpretation and protection of the battlefield.

As the National Park Service testified at our hearing on this measure, these tracts of land are far more historically significant than the recent additions to Manassas Battlefield, which may cost the American taxpayer in excess of \$150 million for about 550 acres. However, since the National Park Service considers the annual appropriations act to be self-authorizing, it is not clear that passage of this measure is a necessary prerequisite to securing the funding needed to carry out this important acquisition.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] for her efforts to secure not only the necessary funding to buy these critical parcels, but also for her efforts to secure operational funding in order to make this park available to the public for the first time in its almost 60-year history. With the location of this battlefield so close to Washington, DC, it is clear this area offers important opportunities for many persons to better appreciate the Civil War.

I encourage my colleagues to support funding sought to purchase these historically significant lands at Monocacy.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I commend this bill to the House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 990, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1250

PALO ALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1642) to establish in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, and for other purposes; as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that:

(1) The study conducted by the National Park Service under section 506(b) of Public Law 95-625 has resulted in a precise identification of the location of the Battle of Palo Alto and the area requiring protection.

(2) Palo Alto is the only unit of the National Park System directed to the preservation and interpretation of resources related to the Mexican-American War.

SEC. 3. PALO ALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to preserve for the education, benefit, and inspiration of present and future generations the nationally significant site of the first battle of the Mexican-American War, and to provide for its interpretation in such manner as to portray the battle and the Mexican-American War and its related political, diplomatic, military and social causes and consequences, there is hereby established the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site in the State of Texas (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "historic site").

(b) BOUNDARY.—(1) The historic site shall consist of approximately 3,400 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site", numbered 469-80,002, and dated March 1991. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(2) Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall file a legal description of the historic site with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. Such legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographic errors in such legal description and in the map referred to in paragraph (1). The legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary may, from time to time, make minor revisions in the boundary of the historic site.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall manage the historic site in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666). The Secretary shall protect, manage, and administer the historic site for the purposes of preserving and interpreting the cultural and natural resources of the historic site and providing for the public understanding and appreciation of the historic site in such a manner as to perpetuate these qualities and values for future generations.

SEC. 5. LAND ACQUISITION.

Within the historic site, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interest in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Lands or interests in lands owned by the State of Texas or political subdivisions thereof may be acquired only by donation.

SEC. 6. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States of Mexico, in accordance with existing international agreements, and with other owners of Mexican-American War properties within the United States of America for the purposes of conducting joint research and interpretive planning for the historic site and related Mexican-American War sites. Interpretive information and programs shall reflect historical data and perspectives of both countries and the series of historical events associated with the Mexican-American War.

SEC. 7. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Within 3 years after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and transmit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a general management plan for the historical site. The plan shall be consistent with section 12 of the Act of August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. 1a-7) and with the purposes of this Act and shall include (but not be limited to) each of the following:

- (1) A resource protection program including land acquisition needs.
- (2) A general visitor use and interpretive program.
- (3) A general development plan including such roads, trails, markers, structures, and other improvements and facilities as may be necessary for the accommodation of visitor use in accordance with the purposes of this Act and the need to preserve the integrity of the historic site.

(4) A research plan.

(5) Identification of appropriate cooperative agreements as identified in section 6.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 1642.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, which was authorized by Public Law 95-625 in 1978 is the only unit in the National Park System that preserves and interprets the history of the Mexican-American War. The battle of Palo Alto, fought on May 8, 1846, was the first battle in the Mexican-American War. That war shaped this country significantly. The lands acquired under the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo that ended the war included all or parts of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California. The war has also profoundly shaped our relationship with Mexico.

H.R. 1642, introduced by Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ increases significantly the authorized acreage at the Mexican-American Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site in Texas. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute that follows the administration's suggestion concerning the cooperative agreements with the United States of Mexico and the United States of America. The legislation, as amended, authorizes instead of directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into such cooperative agreements. The special resource study on the Battle of Palmito Hill is deleted from this bill because it will be studied in the larger Civil War study authorized in the last Congress. The authorization of appropriations for land acquisition is set at \$6 million. In addition, several minor technical changes were made, such as correcting the map reference.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy with H.R. 1642, as amended. I look forward to passage of this legislation and the establishment of Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site

as a full-fledged unit of the National Park System.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1642, a bill which provides for expansion of the existing Palo Alto battlefield. As has already been explained by subcommittee Chairman VENTO, Congress recognized at the time of initial authorization of this unit in 1978, that further park expansion would be likely upon completion of needed research documenting the actual battle location.

In 1982, the National Park Service completed the necessary research. The agency has recently worked with the subcommittee and bill's sponsor, Mr. ORTIZ, to ensure that a reasonable park boundary proposal was developed. While the administration has supported a slightly smaller boundary, I am convinced that the 3400-acre boundary provided under Mr. ORTIZ' legislation will prove more manageable. Other concerns raised in the testimony of the administration have been adequately addressed in this bill as revised.

While some could question whether setting aside a 3400-acre battlefield is the best way to commemorate and remember the Mexican-American War; if Congress makes such a determination, this bill at least represents a reasonable and feasible unit of the National Park System. It is time to begin implementation of legislation which authorized this park 13 years ago.

I commend this bill to my colleagues.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1642, a bill I introduced that would expand the boundaries of the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site. I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman VENTO and Chairman MILLER for their efforts in expeditiously approving this bill.

I would also like to thank the many individuals from my congressional district who traveled all the way from Brownsville, TX, to participate in the hearing before Chairman VENTO's Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. I congratulate their support and enthusiasm for this legislation.

The Palo Alto battlefield is the site of one of the two most important battles of the Mexican-American war fought on American soil in 1846. The historical significance of this war was great, as it led to the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, granting the United States the land from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. This caused the retreat of Mexican sovereignty from the territories they occupied in the west, and encour-

aged the expansion of United States settlement in that direction.

The commemoration and interpretation of the Battle of Palo Alto and the Mexican-American War is strongly supported by individuals and groups within the Brownsville, TX, area and within Mexico.

I would like to especially recognize the vision and leadership shown by Albert Alfonso Champion, without whose historical research and documentation the actual battlefield may have been forever lost to future generations.

It is fitting to commemorate the bravery of all who fought there by preserving this landmark in the spirit of international amity with the United States of Mexico. The battle fought on this field represents the rupture of relations between the United States and Mexico, which are still in the process of healing today, and reminds us that we must strive for brotherhood, unity and peace with our neighbors to the south.

Two future presidents served in this campaign: General Zachary Taylor was in charge at the time of this battle and Lieutenant Ulysses S. Grant gained valuable experience during this war that he would later use to lead the Union Forces in the American Civil War.

This war served as a test-case for the first West Point-trained soldiers, and the U.S. Army's success assured the academy's continued funding.

It was during this battle that the U.S. Army explored the use of light and heavy artillery rather than large cavalry and infantry maneuvers, and explosive shells against the Mexican Army's solid shot; these new battle techniques contributed to the development of American warfare.

The Mexican-American war was the first to be reported by telegraph. Also, this was the first war in which railroads and steamboats were used to transport troops and war supplies. U.S. Army surgeons introduced ether as an anesthetic for the wounded, and combat photography made its debut. Samuel Colt's new revolver was introduced into the fight, resulting in a major contract for his company with the War Department. The occupation of Matamoros, Mexico, during the war led to the development of nearby Brownsville as an important military/economic center.

There has been a great desire on the part of Mexico to preserve this area in order to commemorate the site in honor of those Mexicans who perished in the Battle of Palo Alto. It is probable that both Mexican and American remains are buried on this site. Anthropological exploration of the area indicates that many artifacts dating from the battle still remain undiscovered. As a benefit for historic research purposes, the landscape, setting, and ground cover remain largely undis-

turbed, and alteration of the terrain has been minimal. It would be desirable to protect this historic area in light of the archaeological evidence that in all probability lies below the battle site.

Presently, there is an upright cannon that memorializes the site, set up in 1914 by General James Parker of the First Calvary Brigade at Ft. Sam Houston. In 1893, a local Brownsville patriotic group erected a marble marker which later disappeared. It was reported that two Mexican survivors of the battle were in attendance at the ceremonies.

It is my hope that necessary funding will soon be provided to implement proposed activities at the site which will enhance visitorship.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation by suspending the rules and unanimously approving this legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ] on his work. This is a noncontroversial measure, one that I think deserves the support of all Members, and, as such, I hope it receives it.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SAGUARO NATIONAL MONUMENT EXPANSION ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 292) to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 292

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saguaro National Monument Expansion Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the area generally to the south of the Rincon unit of the Saguaro National Monument contains—

(1) prime Sonoran desert habitat including an exceptionally rich area of Saguaro cactus and palo verde uplands;

(2) an outstanding riparian corridor of large Arizona sycamores and cottonwoods;

(3) important archaeological and cultural sites; and

(4) important habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, javelina, and other species of reptiles, mammals, and birds.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the addition of approximately 3,540 acres to the Rincon unit of the Saguaro National Monument in order to protect, preserve, and interpret the monument's resources, and to provide for the education and benefit of the public.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "expansion area" means the approximately 3,540 acres to be added to the monument pursuant to this Act;

(2) "monument" means the Saguaro National Monument; and

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF MONUMENT BOUNDARIES.

(a)(1) IN GENERAL.—The monument boundaries are hereby revised to include the approximately 3,540 acres of lands and interests in land as generally depicted on the map entitled "Saguaro National Monument Enhanced Boundary", numbered 151/91,001-D, and dated September 1990.

(2) The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the monument boundary by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from another Federal agency, except that lands or interests therein owned by the State of Arizona or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Lands and interests in lands acquired pursuant to this Act shall be administered as part of the monument and shall be subject to all laws applicable to the monument.

(d) AMENDMENT TO GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is directed to amend the monument's general management plan with respect to the use and management of the expansion area.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on S. 292.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 292 authorizes the expansion of the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument in Arizona. Similar legislation was passed by the House of Representatives late in the 101st Congress but was not acted on by the Senate prior to adjournment. This session, the Senate has already passed S. 292, introduced by Senator MCCAIN. Similar legislation (H.R. 664) was introduced on the House side by Representative KOLBE and cosponsored by the former Interior Committee Chairman Representative Morris Udall and the other members of the Arizona delegation.

Saguaro National Monument is comprised of 2 unconnected units located in the fast-growing Tucson area. Because of the monument's urban location, development has steadily expanded around its boundaries. What was, only a few decades ago, open space is now dotted with commercial and residential development. While these changes have altered large sections of land south of the east unit's boundary, significant Saguaro stands still exist in this area, along with important desert wildlife habitat and undeveloped riparian corridors that are uncommon in this desert environment.

S. 292 presents us with a rather unusual situation. Its genesis arises from negotiations between the major affected landowners, the local units of government, and a broad range of local and national groups concerned about the nationally significant resources located in this area. It is obvious that if these lands immediately south of the monument boundary are not protected, at least in part, by inclusion in the monument, they will be developed and the resource values which have a direct relationship to the monument will be lost. We cannot address all the development that will occur adjacent to the monument nor should this bill be construed in any way, shape, or form as endorsing such a procedure but nor do we endorse development, rather in this instance where we have the opportunity to preserve important resource habitat and ecological values, we cannot afford to pass up the opportunity and risk the consequences of further damage to the monument.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that this legislation has the endorsement of the Pima County Board of Supervisors and the Tucson City Council. If the Federal Government is to make this effort to preserve significant resource values in the area, I believe it is incumbent upon the local governments to do their part to address development around the monument boundary in a manner that recognizes the significant resource values found within the Saguaro National Monument. With the high public recognition and interest in these resources, we have the opportunity here

to address resource issues on a cooperative basis before damages occur and confrontations arise. I believe S. 292 can be a positive part of this process and I recommend its adoption by the House.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 292, a bill to add approximately 3,500 acres to the existing Saguaro National Monument on the outskirts of Tucson, AZ. The measure we are considering today is similar to legislation passed by this body last year.

As stated by the subcommittee chairman, rapid urban expansion in the Tucson area has brought development to the doorstep of Saguaro National Monument. This development has resulted in a permanent loss of natural resource values from much of the land in the Tucson basin. The parcel added to Saguaro National Monument under my colleague, Mr. KOLBE's bill, would preserve an area immediately adjacent to the monument. This is an area which still retains such outstanding natural values as high quality saguaro stands and important riparian corridors, as well as habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, and javelina.

The administration opposes this bill due to the lack of a formal boundary study. However, I note that the National Park Service has, within the last 2 years, completed a general management plan for the park. Had the National Park Service complied with existing law and completed a boundary study for that park at the time they were completing their management plan, they would be prepared to respond to this legislation. It is hard to understand why the National Park Service would complete a management plan for Saguaro National Monument and not address boundary questions.

I also want to recognize the efforts of the Rocking K Corp. which is pursuing a development in the vicinity of the proposed park addition. Urbanization is a major issue facing many of our national park system areas today. In order to address the issue of potential impacts on adjacent park resources, this company has proposed to: protect sensitive riparian corridors considered essential for wildlife movement, create a nonprofit corporation focusing on environmental preservation issues, provide public access to the park, and retain almost 70 percent of their total land holding in open space. This is a model which could go a long way on a national basis toward resolving urban encroachment problems at National Park Service areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which enjoys broad support from groups in the Tucson area. This bill deserves the sup-

port of the House and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the prime sponsor in the House of this legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 292, the Saguaro National Monument boundary expansion bill. This bill, sponsored by Senator JOHN MCCAIN, is identical to H.R. 664, introduced on January 28 and sponsored by me and the other Members of the Arizona House delegation. It is a special honor to have as an original cosponsor of this bill my former colleague and friend, Mo Udall. It is fitting that Mo Udall's final bill be one that seeks to protect a national ecological treasure.

The Saguaro National Monument truly is one of the gems in the Nation's string of national parks. It is located at the northern edge of the Sonoran desert and is home to a diverse and spectacular array of plant and animal life. Most notable, of course, are the thick stands of towering, majestic saguaro plants for which the monument is named and which have come to symbolize the southwest desert.

The monument, however, is confronted with increasing urban encroachment and development, the outgrowth of significant population increases in the Tucson metropolitan area that could hardly have been imagined at the time of the monument's creation in 1933. As a result, a coalition of environmental organizations contacted land owners in the area and other interested parties to explore possible additions to the monument. The group reached a consensus and then approached the Arizona delegation with the boundary expansion proposal embodied in H.R. 664 and S. 292—the bill that is before us today.

The additional land will include prime habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, javelina, and other reptiles, birds and mammals. One of the highest quality saguaro cactus stands in the region will be added as well. This is especially important because of the significant decline, estimated at more than 50 percent in the monument's saguaro population.

The bill is drafted to give maximum flexibility in the acquisition of the land. In these times of fiscal restraint, however, it is probable that if the land is to be brought under Federal ownership soon, it would have to be acquired through an exchange, thus eliminating the need for taxpayer expenditures. It should be noted that the proposed expansion area has been part of a major study by some of the foremost experts on the Saguaro National Monument-Rincon area, making unnecessary further taxpayer dollars for a Federal boundary study.

Last year, Chairman UDALL and I introduced legislation identical to this year's bill. The merits of this proposal were then recognized by this body. Despite being introduced late in the session, the bill passed the subcommittee, full committee and the full House in quick order. Unfortunately, time ran out on this legislation in the Senate last October. But the Senate did not miss the opportunity in 1991: S. 292, was adopted by the Senate on voice vote on April 25.

The House began consideration of the boundary expansion bill on May 7, in the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee. On May 14, the subcommittee considered the bill and forwarded it to the full committee.

The House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs considered the bill on May 22 and ordered it favorably reported.

The success of this bill would not have been possible without the help of a number of my colleagues. I would like to especially thank Chairman VENTO and Congressman JAY RHODES for their assistance, as well as Chairman MILLER, ranking minority member on the Interior Committee, Mr. YOUNG, and on the subcommittee, Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a must for all those concerned with preserving and enhancing a national treasure. The proof can be seen in the wide-spread support for the bill, including a host of environmental groups, affected landowners, the city of Tucson and Pima county. S. 292 deserves the same enthusiastic endorsement it received last year from this body. I urge your support.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I yield myself a minute.

I just want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the Arizona delegation. They have a remarkable record of working on land use policy, conservation, environmental issues, in the past years that I have chaired the subcommittee. Obviously part of it is due to the leadership of former Chairman Mo Udall, but a lot of it is also the fact that they have done their homework and themselves are strong supporters of the measures before us, such as Senator MCCAIN is. And when he worked in the House, that was evident from his work in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as that of the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. JAY RHODES, and the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. JIM KOLBE, both of whom I have worked with on a number of different measures.

This is a good measure. It adds nearly 3,500 acres to an existing monument, which is a substantial addition. It does it in such a way, a cooperative manner,

with the local community and the county.

I wish, obviously, that these problems had been solved yesterday, but they were not, so we have to deal with them today. I hope that we continue to address the threat to our national parks in terms of the boundaries, trying to provide some rational administrative boundaries, and to include in significant resources such as this riparian resource, which does have a large number of specimens.

Nobody has said so this afternoon, but the saguaro cactus have had a very tough time in recent years. We do not know quite what the cause of it is. It is important that we continue to pay attention to the existing national monuments and parks such as saguaro, which have been established for a long time. We should not take them for granted. This action obviously does not take it for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 292.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the following rollcall vote, I was unavoidably detained in Texas. I would submit this statement to be included in the RECORD after the votes.

On rollcall No. 122, H.R. 1642, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1310

DESIGNATING CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF ALLEGHENY RIVER IN PENNSYLVANIA AS COMPONENT OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1323) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain segments of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1323

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF ALLEGHENY RIVER.

In order to preserve and protect for present and future generations the outstanding scenic, natural, recreational, scientific, his-

toric, and ecological values of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to assist in the protection, preservation, and enhancement of the fisheries resources associated with such river, section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"() ALLEGHENY, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment from Kinzua Dam downstream approximately 7 miles to the United States Route 6 Bridge, and the segment from Buckaloons Recreation Area at Irvine, Pennsylvania, downstream approximately 47 miles to the southern end of Alcorn Island at Oil City, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river through a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the counties of Warren, Forest, and Venango, as provided under section 10(e) of this Act; and the segment from the sewage treatment plant at Franklin downstream approximately 31 miles to the refinery at Emlenton, Pennsylvania, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river through a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Venango County, as provided under section 10(e) of this Act."

SEC. 2. ADVISORY COUNCILS FOR THE ALLEGHENY NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act 2 advisory councils to advise him on the establishment of final boundaries and the management of the river segments designated by section 1 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River"), as follows:

(1) The Northern Advisory Council, to provide advice for the management of the segments of the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River between Kinzua Dam and Alcorn Island; and

(2) The Southern Advisory Council, to provide advice for the management of the segment of the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River between Franklin and Emlenton.

(b) NORTHERN ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Northern Advisory Council shall be composed of 9 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(A) The Forest Supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest, or his designee, who shall serve as chair of the Council and be a nonvoting member.

(B) The Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or his designee.

(C) 6 members, 2 from each county from recommendations submitted by the County Commissioners of Warren, Forest, and Venango Counties, of which no fewer than 2 such members shall be riparian property owners along the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River.

(D) One member from a nonprofit conservation organization concerned with the protection of natural resources from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(2) Members appointed under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. A vacancy in the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) Members of the Northern Advisory Council shall serve without pay as such and members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no

additional pay by reason of their service on the Commission. Each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(4) The Northern Advisory Council shall cease to exist 10 years after the date on which the Secretary approves the management plan for the Allegheny National Recreation River.

(c) SOUTHERN ADVISORY COUNCIL.—(1) The Southern Advisory Council shall be composed of 7 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(A) The Forest Supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest, or his designee, who shall serve as a nonvoting member.

(B) The Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or his designee, who shall serve as chairman.

(C) 4 members from recommendations submitted by the County Commissioners of Venango County, of which at least one shall be a riparian property owner along the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River.

(D) One member from a nonprofit conservation organization concerned with the protection of national resources, from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(2) Members appointed under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. A vacancy of the county representatives on the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) Members of the Southern Advisory Council shall serve without pay as such and members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay by reason of their service on the Commission. Each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(4) The Southern Advisory Council shall cease to exist 10 years after the date on which the Secretary approves the management plan for the Allegheny National Recreation River.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION OF ALLEGHENY NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—After consultation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, advisory councils, local governments, and the public, and within 18 months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall take such action with respect to the segments of the Allegheny River designated under section 1 of this Act as is required under section 3(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(b) INTERIM MEASURES.—As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary, shall issue guidelines specifying standards for local zoning ordinances, pursuant to section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, with the objective of protecting the outstandingly remarkable values of the Allegheny Wild and Scenic River, as defined by the Secretary. Once issued, such guidelines shall have the force and effect provided in section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN SEGMENTS.—(1) Land and mineral rights acquired by the Secretary for the purpose of managing the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River segments located between Kinzua Dam and Alcorn Island shall be added to and become part of the Allegheny National Forest.

(2) Land and mineral rights acquired by the Secretary for the purpose of managing the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River segment located between Franklin and

Emlenton may be managed under a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

SEC. 5 STUDY RIVERS.

(a) STUDY.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"() CLARION, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment of the main stem of the river from Ridgway to its confluence with the Allegheny River. The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the study of such segment.

"() MILL CREEK, JEFFERSON AND CLARION COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment of the main stem of the creek from its headwaters near Gumbert Hill in Jefferson County, downstream to the confluence with the Clarion River."

SEC. 6 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Vento].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1323, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1323 is a bipartisan measure introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER, and our Interior Committee colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. KOSTMAYER.

The bill would designate some 85 miles of the Allegheny River, in northwestern Pennsylvania, for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. It is similar to a bill that was approved by our committee and passed by the House late in the last Congress on which action was not completed. The major difference in the legislation introduced this year is the addition of provisions for study of two tributary streams.

The bill is not controversial, so far as I am aware. There is agreement by all concerned, including the administration, that the segments of the river that would be designated by the bill are deserving of management consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Similarly, the proposal to study the additional areas was supported when the bill was being considered by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands.

The Interior Committee did adopt some amendments, primarily of a technical nature, including one that would revise section 3(b) of the bill, related to

interim measures, in accordance with a suggestion made by the Forest Service at our hearing on the bill.

The revised language would direct the Secretary to use existing authority, under section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to issue guidelines for local actions to protect the values of the designated segments of the Allegheny River.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and basically the same as one that was approved by the House in the last Congress. I urge its approval again, and I hope that the Senate will be able to complete action on it reasonably soon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1323, a bill to designate 85 miles of the Allegheny River in northwestern Pennsylvania as a unit of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is an important measure which will protect certain "outstandingly remarkable" river values that were first recognized 13 years ago.

The Forest Service has studied and fully evaluated the resources of this river. The provisions of this bill regarding specific river segments to be designated are consistent with the results of their studies. The administration has testified in support of non-Federal management for those river segments entirely outside the forest boundary. Such a position is reasonable in terms of Federal fiscal limitations, as well as recognition of the outstanding river protection program implemented by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to see that while Federal management for the entire 85 miles has been retained, the revised language in this bill does set the proper parameters for limiting Federal control over local land use measures.

This is a bipartisan effort, representing the close cooperation between Mr. CLINGER and Mr. KOSTMAYER. I commend them for working together and bringing forward a bill which builds upon the thorough planning conducted by the Forest Service.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. As has been indicated, it covers 85 miles of the Allegheny River which qualify for management as wild and scenic river under the law, has been studied by the Forest Service, and has been through all the procedures that I think are necessary.

We set in motion some additional analysis to be done on some tributaries.

As has been indicated, it is a measure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER], who serves on the committee, had worked on. It passed in the last session.

I think that there is no controversy that I am aware of with regard to the Members, and so I just commend it to you. It deserves to be enacted today—passed by the House today.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1323, which will designate 85 miles of Allegheny River in northwestern Pennsylvania as recreational under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Last October, the House passed this legislation, but unfortunately, the other body could not act before the 101st Congress adjourned.

Many people deserve thanks for bringing this legislation to the floor today in a bipartisan manner. I would especially like to thank my colleague, Congressman PETER KOSTMAYER. His help and hard work have proved invaluable in moving this legislation forward. Also, I'm pleased that we have had the support of the entire Pennsylvania delegation in designating the Allegheny River as a valuable recreational resource for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Allegheny River flows through some of the most beautiful forests in America. Its soft, rolling hills and majestic trees make a trip along the river truly inspirational and bring to mind the grandeur that makes up so much of America's wilderness. A brief excerpt from Frederick Way's 1942 book, "The Allegheny," sums it up nicely:

... Strange and untamed and little explored. Curious that such a place should exist so close to civilization and still be untouched. Miles and miles of pioneer river. ... The Allegheny River is a breed of its own, and it should remain so!

This bill will formalize and continue the long tradition of recreation on the Allegheny River. For generations, people have used this waterway for fishing, canoeing, camping, and other recreational activities. This designation would ensure that that tradition continues.

Of the 85 miles that would be designated, 30 percent cuts through the Allegheny National Forest, with the rest flowing through States and private lands. The national recreational river designation will also add additional protection to the many islands of the Allegheny River, including those designated as wilderness in the 1984 Pennsylvania Wilderness Act.

Because some of the lands are private, this bill sets up two citizen advisory councils to ensure a high level of input from private citizens and local governments. In fact, the local residents will have a major voice in drafting the management plan that will be the U.S. Forest Service. This plan will determine final boundaries and allow local citizens a large role in managing the river in the future.

Besides protecting the Allegheny, this legislation will also study the Clarion River from Ridgway to its confluence with the Allegheny to see if it too can be protected. A stream in Jefferson and Clarion Counties, the Millcreek, would also be studied.

The Allegheny River is a beautiful natural resource and this legislation will ensure that it receives protection as soon as possible.

I strongly urge all of my House colleagues to join the Pennsylvania delegation in supporting this important environmental legislation. We've crafted a good bill and it deserves to be enacted into law.

Additionally, I am very hopeful that the companion legislation the late Senator Heinz introduced, which is now being moved by Senator ARLEN SPECTER, will pass soon in the other body.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives takes another step in helping to protect the beauty of western Pennsylvania, by considering H.R. 1323, a bill that would designate 85 miles of the Allegheny River as a component of the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and study the Clarion River for potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I would like to thank both Chairman VENTO for moving so rapidly on H.R. 1323, and Congressman BILL CLINGER for all of his work and support, and for introducing the bill that he and I have been working on for several years to protect the beauty and scenery of the Allegheny River.

The Interior Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chaired, held a hearing in 1989 in Pittsburgh to review operations and policies in the Allegheny National Forest [ANF]. One of the major focal points was the draft Forest Service report on recommending protection strategies for the Allegheny River. Congressman CLINGER and I became convinced that indeed the river was worthy of Federal protection and that there was substantial public support for such a proposal. Representative CLINGER, who represents that region of Pennsylvania, and I developed a piece of legislation that would bring 85 miles of the Allegheny River under the protection of the U.S. Forest Service, and yet it would be done so in cooperation with local communities and landowners. This bill enjoys the support of the entire Pennsylvania delegation.

H.R. 1323 calls for Forest Service management both inside and outside the proclamation boundary of the ANF. But this should present no problem. The U.S. Forest Service can and should provide leadership in protecting resources in and near national forests. Additionally, the Forest Service plays a vital role in advising private landowners and communities how to protect important forests, watersheds, and open space through the State and Private Forestry Program.

Mr. Speaker, this would be only the second wild and scenic river designation in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I look forward to working with Congressman CLINGER and the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation to bring this kind of protection to many other rivers in our beautiful State. In fact, I hope to bring to the floor sometime this summer my bill to designate portions of the Delaware River as wild and scenic, and will be working with the Pennsylvania delegation on an omnibus river protection bill for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Again, I appreciate the House acting on this bill at such a busy time and I look forward to enacting this bipartisan effort this year.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1323, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2042) to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2042

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) \$25,550,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992;

"(E) \$26,521,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993; and

"(F) \$27,529,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994."

SEC. 2. PRIORITY ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—In expending funds appropriated pursuant to the amendments made by section 1 of this Act, the United States Fire Administration shall give priority to—

(1) reducing the incidence of residential fires, especially in residences of the very old or very young in urban and rural areas, through the development and dissemination of public education and awareness programs, through arson research and technical assistance programs, and through research and development on new technologies;

(2) working with State Fire Marshals and other State level fire safety offices to identify fire problems that are national in scope;

(3) disseminating information about the activities and programs of the United States Fire Administration to State and local fire services;

(4) enhancing the residential sprinkler program, including research, demonstration activities, and technical assistance to the public and private sectors;

(5) enhancing research into sprinkler programs in areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply;

(6) through the National Fire Academy, enhancing the residential and field program in support of State level training programs,

particularly those that support the volunteer fire service; and

(7) strengthening programs that help protect the lives and safety of fire and emergency medical services personnel, including research into causes of death and injuries, research and development on new technologies to mitigate and prevent injuries, dissemination of information, and technical assistance to State and local fire departments.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The United States Fire Administration shall, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report to Congress on the activities taken pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 3. REPORT ON PUBLIC LAW 101-391, THE HOTEL AND MOTEL FIRE SAFETY ACT OF 1990.

The United States Fire Administration shall, by October 15, 1991, report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on its progress in implementing the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990. Such report shall specify the nature of expenditures made to that date, as well as including an estimate of the costs and a specific schedule for implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER].

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2042, the reauthorization of appropriations under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

The current authorization of appropriations under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Fire is the third leading cause of accidental death, resulting in more than 6,000 deaths each year. At least 80 percent of all fire fatalities occur in homes. Due to the serious nature of the residential fire problem, H.R. 2042 directs the Fire Administration to submit a report to the Congress within 1 year on activities taken to give priority to reducing residential fires.

In human terms, far too many people die needlessly by fire each year. Senior citizens over 65 and children under 5 are disproportionately represented in fire deaths. Blacks and native Americans have extremely high fire death rates. People living in large cities and rural areas have a much higher risk of death from fire than those in suburban areas and small towns. In economic terms, the total cost of fire to the American public is about \$30 billion annually.

The U.S. Fire Administration is striving to reduce the incidence of accidental fires. Its programs include smoke detector research, fire prevention, arson research, management and firefighter health and safety research, data collection and analysis to enhance

our knowledge of the scope and magnitude of fire problems, public fire education campaigns, and specialized training and management programs for the fire services.

H.R. 2042, authorizes appropriations of \$25,550,000 for fiscal year 1992, with inflationary increases for fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994. The authorization level for fiscal year 1992 is consistent with the administration's budget request.

The bill directs the Fire Administration to give priority to seven activities, including the reduction of residential fires, among the groups most vulnerable to fire and in geographical areas hardest hit by fire. It requires research into the development of sprinkler programs for areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply.

And the bill requires the Fire Administration to report on its progress in implementing the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990.

I want to acknowledge the contributions of the gentleman from California, Mr. PACKARD ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Science, particularly with regard to the need to improve fire fighting capabilities in areas with limited water supplies.

I urge support for H.R. 2042.

□ 1320

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2042, which reauthorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1994.

The U.S. Fire Administration was created by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 as the Federal agency with responsibility for fire reduction efforts at the national level. This country loses almost 6,000 people each year to fires. Out of this tragic number, the most vulnerable groups are the very young and the very old.

A statistic which is truly alarming to me is that the vast majority of fire deaths occur in the home. That is why H.R. 2042 requires the U.S. Fire Administration to report to the Congress, within 1 year, on the activities taken by the Fire Administration to reduce the number of residential fires.

The bill directs the Fire Administration to give priority to seven activities—including an area which is of great importance to me—enhancing research into sprinkler programs in areas or structures where there is little or no domestic water supply. This provision has applicability to mobile homes and rural areas, and of particular significance to me is its applicability to drought-stricken California.

California has been devastated by the ongoing drought conditions. Conservation of the precious water supply is absolutely essential, especially now since 1991 ranks as the driest of the 5 years of drought. It is reported that so far, Cali-

fornia has reduced its normal deliveries of water to municipal and industrial users, including the metropolitan water district of southern California, by 80 percent. Deliveries to agricultural users have been eliminated and are not expected to be resumed this year.

I am hopeful that the provision on sprinkler systems for limited water supplies will have a positive impact on the drought-stricken Southwest which literally has no water to spare.

In conclusion, I want to state that I support this bill because it provides funding for essential fire prevention efforts and it accomplishes this at the level of the President's request for fiscal year 1992. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, for his efforts to work cooperatively on this bill and for his efforts to move this bill to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

I urge all members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased to add my support to this legislation. The authorization level represents the President's request for fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

The success of the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy are obvious in the dramatic decrease in fire-related deaths over the past 15 years. These organizations are responsible for the dissemination of up-to-date fire prevention information to fire companies across the country, and it is this network that has enhanced fire service training and reduced fire loss.

Although all firefighters benefit from the training efforts of the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy, the thousands of small volunteer fire companies across the country are perhaps the most dependent on these programs. The fire programs have provided invaluable assistance to individual communities, and have resulted in real savings of human life and property.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2041, a bill to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as a Member who has seen the tragedy of fire strike in my own congressional district.

On March 29, 1991, in Port Jervis, New York, a tragic fire killed three children and their grandfather during the early morning hours. The family died from smoke inhalation after being overcome by smoke even before the flames raced through their wood-frame home. Fire investigators have found no evidence of smoke detector devices.

Following this tragedy, I learned that the family received section 8 rental assistance and that HUD does not require smoke detectors in section 8 subsidized housing rented to low-income and/or elderly individuals. In addition, I have been apprised that the Nation's taxpayers will spend \$11.6 billion this year on federally subsidized section 8 housing programs. However, the 2.6 million families receiving section 8 across America do not have the protection needed by smoke alarms.

Accordingly, along with Senator D'AMATO, I have introduced H.R. 2099, the Fire Safety Enhancement Act, requiring the installation and maintenance of smoke detectors in all households financed with HUD programs—the only chance that this Port Jervis family had for survival.

Mr. Speaker, while it is too late to help the family in Port Jervis, with the support of my colleagues, we may be able to save other families throughout our Nation. Similarly with the support of the House today, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act authorization can strengthen our Nation's ability to protect its citizens against the horrors and tragedy of fire.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for this legislation. As the chairman of the congressional fire services caucus, I am pleased that Congress is again renewing the Federal commitment to reducing fire injuries and deaths.

As we are all too well aware, more than 6,000 people lose their lives to fire each year. The U.S. record of fire losses is among the worst of any industrialized nation. Fire kills, and its victims are often those least able to escape its clutches: The very young, the very old, and the sick.

The key to reducing the record of fire deaths is prevention. For that reason, I am extremely pleased that this committee made fire prevention in residential areas the No. 1 priority for the U.S. Fire Administration. Fully three-quarters of the deaths and two-thirds of the injuries caused by fire occur in the home. Renewed emphasis by the USFA on this problem will help reverse these terrible statistics.

I am also pleased to see that the bill directs the USFA to expand its efforts to promote the use of residential sprinklers. The majority of residential fires in 1987 occurred in homes without smoke detectors. In an alarming 41 percent of such fires where smoke detectors were present, the units either failed to operate or activated too late to save the residents. Expanded use of sprinklers will save hundreds and hundreds of lives in the years to come. I would also mention the importance of considering other fire safety technologies, including building design and materials, which can have a significant impact on fire safety.

I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation to the President of the United States. For years, this committee and other concerned Members of Congress had to fight to keep these programs alive. Each year, the Office of Management and Budget recommended elimination of the Federal fire programs, and each year, this committee restored them. Fortunately, the current resident of the White House understands the nature of the fire problem in America and included an increase in funds for the U.S. Fire Administra-

tion in his fiscal year 1992 budget. The President's cooperation and concern for America's domestic defender has been truly outstanding.

I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. BROWN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. WALKER, for bringing this important legislation to the floor. Subcommittee Chairman RICK BOUCHER and the ranking member RON PACKARD also deserve a great deal of credit for their work in crafting this bill. It is this committee which stood against previous efforts to eliminate the Federal fire programs, and it is clear that their efforts are being recognized by those of us inside the beltway. I know that the American Fire Service is glad to have strong allies on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2042 is a good bill, one that will help save lives and property. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in 1974, Congress passed the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act, which established the U.S. Fire Administration. The Fire Act created new national authorities and a Federal focus to reduce the devastating fire losses that occur annually in this Nation. Each year, fire kills more Americans than all other national emergencies combined, including floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes.

Many of the programs of the U.S. Fire Administration have been responsible for cutting fire fatalities in half over the past 20 years from roughly 12,000 in the early 1970's to about 6,000 now. However, in spite of the progress that has been made in reducing fire deaths, the United States still has one of the highest fire-death rates per capita in the industrialized world. The total cost of fire which includes losses plus the cost of protection, fire departments, and insurance overhead is \$30 billion per year.

H.R. 2042, directs the U.S. Fire Administration to give priority to several areas which include: First, reducing the residential fire problem; second, working with State level fire safety offices to identify fire problems that are national in scope; third, disseminating information about the activities of the U.S. Fire Administration to State and local fire services; fourth, enhancing research into the establishment of sprinkler programs in areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply; fifth, enhancing the residential sprinkler program; sixth, enhancing fire fighter training programs at the National Fire Academy, particularly those that support the volunteer fire services; and seventh, strengthening programs that help protect the lives and safety of fire and emergency medical personnel.

The funding level in the bill for fiscal year 1992 is consistent with the administration's request and for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 the funding levels reflect increases for inflation.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues on the Subcommittee on Science, RICK BOUCHER, chairman, and RON PACKARD, ranking Republican member, and my distinguished colleague, ROBERT WALKER, ranking Republican member of the committee, for the expeditious manner in which this bill has been brought to the floor.

By one's and two's, fire claims an average of 16 victims each day and continues to be a serious burden on the national economy. I

urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 2042, the authorization of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act for fiscal year 1992-94, to provide programs that mitigate the enormous fire threat in this Nation.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2042, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2042.

The question was taken.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained on my return from an Education and Labor field hearing in the 19th District of Pennsylvania, and was unable to participate in activities on the floor of the House. Had I been present, however, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2042, "yea" on S. 483, and "yea" on H.R. 1642.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a prior commitment in my district prevented me from being present on the House floor when recorded votes were ordered on several suspensions. Had I been present at the time of the votes, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 2042, H.R. 1642, and S. 483.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, due to previously scheduled hearings on health care and on Lake Champlain, I was unable to be present for the three recorded votes taken. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 1642, the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991; "aye" on H.R. 2042, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act Authorization, and "aye" on S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall votes No. 122, 123, and 124. Had I been

present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Roll No. 122: "Yea" on passage of H.R. 1642, establishing in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site.

Roll No. 123: "Yea" on passage of H.R. 2042, authorizing appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Roll No. 124: "Yea" on passage of S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

MANAGING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request involving a special order coming up directly after the conduct of business by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] be designated as the manager of my special order in my absence. I expect to be gone for just a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TACONIC MOUNTAINS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 483) entitled the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 483

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) large tracts of undeveloped forest land in Vermont's Taconic Mountain Range are threatened by conversion to nonforest uses;

(2) lands included in the Green Mountain National Forest are forever open to all Americans;

(3) the Green Mountain National Forest permanently protects forest for their environmental and economic benefits through the management of range, recreation, timber, water, wilderness, and fish and wildlife resources;

(4) the Bennington County Regional Commission supports expanding the Green Mountain National Forest boundary to include the Taconic Mountain Range; and

(5) the Vermont General Assembly has enacted legislation consenting to the acquisition by the Federal Government of lands throughout the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County for inclusion in the Green Mountain National Forest.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to expand the boundaries of the Green Mountain National Forest to include the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County.

SEC. 2. GREEN MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST EXPANSION.

The boundaries of the Green Mountain National Forest are hereby modified to include all lands depicted on a map entitled "Taconic Mountain Range Expansion" dated March 1, 1991, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office

of the Chief of the Forest Service, Washington, District of Columbia. Within the area delineated on such map, the Secretary shall utilize his authorities under the Act of March 1, 1911 (chapter 186, 36 Stat. 961 as amended), to acquire lands, waters, and interests therein. Lands so acquired shall be managed under such Act for National Forest purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 483—the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991—authorizes the expansion of the Green Mountain National Forest to include the 185,000 acres of the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County, VT.

This proposed expansion of the Green Mountain National Forest has the support of the people of Bennington County, VT, and the State's congressional delegation.

S. 483 will protect and guarantee public access to an important natural resource that is now threatened with conversion to nonforest uses, particularly residential development. Most of the lands within the proposed expansion area are rugged, undeveloped forest and meadow areas, and it also includes the headwaters of two highly rated trout streams. The U.S. Forest Service has stated its intention to acquire these privately owned lands on a willing-seller basis.

Mr. Speaker, the Taconic Mountain Range is a logical addition to the Green Mountain National Forest and I urge the House to support this legislation.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of S. 483. It passed our committee on a voice vote. I urge its adoption.

S. 483 will protect and guarantee public access to an important natural resource that is now threatened with conversion to nonforest use, particularly residential development. Most of the lands within the proposed expansion area are rugged, undeveloped forest and meadow areas, and it also includes the headwaters of two highly rated trout streams. The U.S. Forest Service has stated its intention to acquire these privately owned lands on a willing-seller basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of our colleagues

on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 483.

The question was taken.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which the motion was entertained later today following the recognition of Members for special order speeches.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order today may be called at a later time so we may allow the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

BASIC RESEARCH IS THE WELLSPRING OF KNOWLEDGE FROM WHICH ALL TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION IS DERIVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing me to proceed at this time.

Today, members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, are engaging in special orders for the purpose of underscoring the value of federally funded research. I will initially deliver a set of remarks concerning that subject and then yield to other members of the full committee who are scheduled to deliver remarks as well.

Mr. Speaker, high technology innovation—the innovation that drives our economy forward and contributes most directly to increasing our standard of living—can only occur if new knowledge is constantly generated through basic research. But it has been estimated that there is, on average, a 7- to

20-year lag between the time that an innovative concept is discovered by a basic researcher, and the time that this innovation can be commercialized by the private sector. Furthermore, there can be no way to control the direction or predict the results of basic research in order to guarantee a particular type of innovation in a particular amount of time.

For example, the great British scientist Ernest Rutherford studied the structure of atoms, and early in this century determined that the heat produced by radioactive elements was caused by changes in their atomic makeup. When asked about the practical applications of his discovery, Rutherford said: "Anyone who expects a source of power from the transformation of these atoms is talking moonshine." Yet the radioactive decay which he investigated is the very process that allows us to generate electricity from nuclear reactors.

The most important high technology innovation of the past 50 years—the transistor—could not have been developed without fundamental discoveries in the basic science of quantum physics. The implications of these discoveries could not have been predicted by anyone. Walter H. Brattain, one of the original discoverers of the transistor effect, stated:

The transistor came about because fundamental knowledge had developed to a stage where human minds could understand phenomena that had been observed for a long time. It is noteworthy that a breakthrough came from work dedicated to understanding fundamental physics, rather than from the cut-and-try method of producing a useful device.

Furthermore, it was more than twenty years between the invention of the transistor, in 1947, and the emergence of a mature industry based on integrated circuit technology in the 1970's. It was almost 50 years between Rutherford's discovery of radioactive decay and the development of the controlled fission reactor. These types of time lags are typical.

In other words, the investment that we make in basic scientific and engineering research today will be the source of knowledge for our high technology industries in the first decades of the 21st century. If we chose to reduce our R&D budget now, we cannot know the specific consequences of our action, we cannot know what we will not discover. We do know, however, that the other industrialized nations of the world are choosing this time to increase their R&D investments, and that the discoveries we fail to make at home today may well be made by scientists abroad tomorrow.

The slow and unpredictable nature of scientific and technological innovation prevents private industry from funding a significant portion of our nation's basic research. Yet a continued flow of basic scientific discoveries is abso-

lutely critical to maintaining our high technology competitiveness and economic vitality. For these reasons, the Federal Government has always been—and must continue to be—the primary sponsor of basic research.

The rationale for federal sponsorship of basic research was perhaps best expressed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, in his 1945 work "Science, the Endless Frontier." He wrote:

Without scientific progress the national health would deteriorate; without scientific progress we could not hope for improvement in our standard of living or for an increased number of jobs for our citizens; and without scientific progress we could not have maintained our liberties against tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I think those words speak eloquently to the need for a sustained Federal commitment to basic research. I know now that other of my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee will underscore those very points.

First, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, space station Freedom represents a major element of the U.S. presence in space. It will contribute to the continuing U.S. space leadership far into the 21st century.

□ 1340

This leadership will be evident not only in space technology and operations but also in education, economic competitiveness, space science and commercial applications. Undoubtedly, the area where elimination of the U.S. presence on the space station will have the most profound impact is in the area of international cooperation. The Europeans, the Japanese, and the Canadians are relying on the United States to honor the commitment we made when we first entered into the international agreement to work together to build space station Freedom.

The concept of space station Freedom was actually initiated by the United States when, in 1984, then-President Reagan invited friends and allies of the United States to participate in its development.

The intergovernmental agreement was signed in September 1988. Shortly after the action taken by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the director general of the European Space Agency, Jean-Marie Luton, wrote to Vice President DAN QUAYLE expressing ESA's grave concern over the apparently imminent cancellation of the space station. He stated that the threat to the station does great damage to the credibility in U.S.-international cooperative agreements.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs for Japan, Taro Nakayama, has written Secretary of State James Baker to express that country's concern. He states that elimination of the U.S. commitment to the space station would result

in nullification of agreements for major joint efforts among the international partners and inevitable damage to U.S. credibility as a partner in any major and big science project.

The president of the Canadian Space Agency, Larkin Kerwin, in his letter to Admiral Truly, has stated,

I fear that withdrawal of the U.S. from this program after all of the international partners have invested so much in good faith will have far-reaching implications for the future of international cooperation in space.

These are, to me, extremely ominous and foreboding messages that should seriously be considered in the debate over the station. Backing out of this crucial international commitment could have devastating and longlasting ramifications for the United States' ability to enter into other international cooperatives in the future.

I might mention that on the Subcommittee on Space and on the full Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we are planning international cooperation on other major big science projects, the superconducting super collider being one of them.

So we are not just talking about the space station or space-related initiatives.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a very important point with regard to the superconducting super collider. This Nation is attempting to embark on a number of major items that will influence basic science research for some time to come. The space station is one of those, the superconducting super collider is another. If in fact we were to back out of the space station, the chances of getting any international partners willing to come in on a superconducting super collider are almost impossible. They are going to see that the investments they have made on the space station went down the tubes, and they are not going to put billions of dollars into a project that we may not be able or may not be willing to follow through on.

It is my understanding that the Japanese have already indicated that if the space station falls through, there is no way that they are going to come in on the superconducting super collider. Why is that important? Well, because the Japanese are expected to come up with maybe as much as a billion dollars of money for the superconducting super collider, a billion dollars of money that the American taxpayers would not have to put into that project. That kind of international cooperation will be essential to making certain the superconducting super collider goes forward. And if the space station fails, then the SSC will fail and

this Nation will be left with a dearth of big science projects.

Now, of course, there are some people who say, "Well, we do not need these big science projects." Well, the fact is we ought to be very careful about what we commit to. But in the case of the space station, we now have a 6- to 7-year commitment that we have regularly followed through on, only to have it knocked out as we get into the fundamentals of it by the Appropriations Committee. It is that kind of unreliability that will make it impossible not only to do big science projects but also to do small science projects with our international partners. So, the gentleman makes an absolutely essential point in all of this, that we will have no international cooperation on science at all if we continue this pattern of backing out at the last moment after international partners have made commitments to cooperative scientific efforts.

Mr. PACKARD. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right on target. I think the most intriguing part of this whole debate and question is that this is at the very moment when the United States is trying to encourage international cooperation in space. We are even looking to the Soviet Union, which we have never done before, for cooperative efforts and to eliminate duplication in space. I think all countries involved in space recognize it has got to be a global effort because of the costs and because of the experimentation and the development that could take place there. Certainly we are looking to enhance our cooperative efforts with foreign countries, and this would come at the very moment that when we want their help, when we will be seeking their help on other programs even in space, and it would be ludicrous for us to send the message that this will send that in fact we do not want to cooperate, we are not reliable partners. And on most of these big science projects we know we cannot do them alone. I think most Members of Congress, certainly many members of the committee, realize that the superconducting super collider project is dead if we cannot get international cooperation. We simply cannot afford that kind of a project with our budget as it is today, its limited budget.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to underscore the point: These international partners of ours, this is not a minor matter for them because in several cases they have already invested hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars into the space station. The Japanese are developing a module for the space station. They have gone ahead and done the work on that module and have literally hundreds of millions of dollars of investment that have been put forward already. They are out that money. If there is no space station for them to put that module on, that is

going to be lost money for them. They are going to be very unhappy, and rightfully should be. The Europeans the same way. There is an ESA module to go on that station. If we back out, the Europeans will have put hundreds of millions of dollars into that particular project, only to find that the United States is not going to fly the station for which it was designed.

Those kinds of problems have long-term ramifications to them. That will not be forgotten soon, and it will certainly undermine our efforts to get additional cooperation. As the gentleman pointed out, we are seeking other cooperation with nations like the Soviet Union. They will certainly look upon what has happened here with a great deal of suspicion.

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the gentleman for that very timely statement.

Perhaps even more pressing than the damage to our international credibility is the fact that America will lose its dominant leadership in space. We have led the world in space up till this point. We will be at risk of losing that dominant leadership role.

Let us all realize that the space agencies will quickly—foreign space agencies—will quickly fill this void. Japan is aggressively increasing its space commitment. The European Space Agency has evolved into a diversified and efficient organization with programs in fundamental research, Earth observations and telecommunications. It has become a dominant player in both space research and commercial space activities.

They will quickly fill the void if the United States loses or even falters in its leadership in space. It is clear that if America abdicates its leadership role, these other countries will take over the leadership role and America would have no hope of playing a role, a permanent role, as a permanent manned infrastructure in space developed.

And then, in addition to that, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania eloquently pointed out that these other countries, our foreign partners in the space station, have spent millions and in some cases billions of dollars to this point because of these international agreements and commitments and now they will lose that. That says nothing for the billions that the American people have paid into the space station program to this point. And if we scuttle it now, we will lose, we will have lost those billions of dollars of investment. So it is very short-sighted for us to lose the billions that the American taxpayers have paid into the space station to this point. We are essentially on schedule. We have revised the program to where it is doable, and it would be a tragic mistake for us to now pull the economic and budget rug out from under the space station and then throw down the tube the billions of dol-

lars that the American taxpayers have put into our portion, not to say anything of the, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania already pointed out, the foreign investments in their modules.

We have spent billions on the space station, and that would be money wasted. That would be a tragic replay of what this Government does, and this Congress often also all too often does, and that is we start a major program, we put billions of dollars of taxpayers' money into it only to pull the rug out at the most inopportune time and lose that investment. Here we are talking about a major investment into America's future, into the space future, and into the education of this country.

We would lose one of the significant inducements and exciting opportunities for young science students as they begin to start a science career, if we pulled out of the space station.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman makes another, I think, essential point in this debate, and that is that the U.S. Government has invested, as the gentleman pointed out, billions of dollars already into the space station.

□ 1350

Just as important as that investment though is what it has accomplished. With that investment teams of industries have been put together in this country, and they have hired on people who are devoted to work for the space station, supposedly over a long period of time. Now if we pull out now, all of those teams will have to be disbanded so that we will lose all the scientific talent that was brought together in order to move ahead with the space station, so the unreliability of the U.S. Government will not only be an issue with our foreign partners, it will be an issue with American aerospace industries that are geared up to do this work. Those industries are going to become very suspicious of putting their own money up front on some of these projects if in fact it appears as though the American Government can never get its act together well enough, and the blame is here, in the Congress, and I think Congress has to accept the blame for this because the fact is each administration, including the Bush administration, has wanted to proceed forward on the space station, and the frustration we have run into now is on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has its role to play in all this, if we understand that, but somewhere along the line, once full commitments are made, we do have to have the will, and in some cases the courage, to follow through on the projects that involve, not only commitments of the U.S. Government, but involve commitments of private enterprise, involve commitments of international partners and a whole series of other people.

So, the gentleman makes an important point, that to back out now is going to be very costly in terms of taxpayer dollars, but also in terms of our ability to at some point in the future be able to continue doing the kinds of work that the Federal Government has always done in basic research.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my statement with one other comment, and that is to me a very, very significant part of this whole issue, whether we ought to continue this space station or not. Up to this point, and I believe for the foreseeable future, the space station is the centerpiece, it is the linchpin, of our space program for as far as I can foresee in the future. We take that very, very important component out of our space planning and our space future, and we may jeopardize exploration of other planets because we needed and we will need a platform from which to launch our exploration into outer space, and, if we do not have the space station, which is part of that plan, we will end up jeopardizing other major components of our space planning and space future, and thus, being the centerpiece and, to me, the linchpin of this entire, our entire, space future, it would be very short sighted to throw that out at this point in time.

I think also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is very much aware of the efforts that are being made. He has been a very important part of that effort, as I have been, of trying to encourage more and more privatization of our space program, and we foresee that the space station is one of the major portions of the space program that we will encourage and be able to involve private enterprise in research, in development, and in activities with the space station.

But in order for that to take place, we must have a Government commitment to the space station. The private sector will not be able to manage to come up with the funds, nor the ingenuity, to put a space station up from the private sector. But there is no question that the private sector will use that space station and will establish laboratory facilities and development facilities in the future, and so we will be losing the credibility of the private sector, and our efforts to move our space program more and more into the private sector will be significantly jeopardized if we pull the space station rug out from underneath this effort to move more and more to the private sector.

So, my colleagues, I truly hope and pray that the Congress will be wise enough to recognize the value of the space station, will reinstate it into the budget, and it will allow us to move forward with the space station as planned and thus retain the credibility of our foreign partners, retain the credibility of the science community of

this country, and retain the credibility of the private sector, as they have made their plans to be involved in this space station.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for his extremely important statement, and I want to associate myself with his remarks. I will probably repeat some of them as a matter of fact, but repetition in this case is intended to provide emphasis, and the points that the gentleman has made require a great deal of emphasis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago President John F. Kennedy challenged our Nation to put a man on the Moon before that decade was over and America charged into the space race with this mission. We accomplished in those 8 years something that has not been repeated since the Apollo Program was completed.

Today we face no less a challenge. There are scientific and technological difficulties that exist now that are equally pressing. We face the possibility of the loss of our global economic competitiveness in high-technology fields. Space station Freedom will be a vital part of helping maintain America's preeminence as a technology-based society. For the past three decades we have been the leader in space exploration, both manned and unmanned. The achievement of permanent manned capability of the space station will insure that our leadership will continue into the 21st century.

We funded the Apollo Program during the 1960's at a yearly funding level that was six times greater than the baselined yearly funding level for the space station. The Apollo Program was designed for the specific purpose of putting an American on the Moon, not to carry out specific scientific capabilities. Yet a tremendous amount of scientific and technological benefit resulted from those early programs. Space station Freedom on the other hand is specifically designed to carry out scientific research among its other capabilities. It has also been designed to be expanded in scope in the future if we so desire. Funding for the space station Freedom program is an excellent investment.

A strong manned-space program has always been a part of our civil space objectives. We began with the success of the Mercury Program. The names of these early pioneers invoke a sense of national pride and accomplishment. The undaunted American spirit throughout this program and through the Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle successes led to achievements unparalleled in the history of mankind. These successful years have stimulated overall NASA program growth. This has resulted in increased support for all of NASA's programs particularly space

science. The space station project will insure the continued success of not only our manned space program, but of all of our space efforts.

Space station Freedom is the centerpiece, an important part of the U.S. civil space program. We have established the goal of returning to the Moon and proceeding with the manned exploration of Mars. If these worthwhile goals are to be achieved, we must be able to study and experience the effects of long-term manned existence in space. Space station Freedom is crucial to this effort. It is the only credible laboratory within which to study the effects on humans of the space environment, an environment in which we must learn to live safely and productively if we are to accomplish our space exploration goals. As the Augustine committee on the future of the space program has concluded,

The committee holds the strong conviction that if the U.S. is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element of that endeavor.

I wholeheartedly agree.

The National Academy of Sciences, in its 1988 report to the incoming Bush administration, stated that "some form of space station is essential to establish the feasibility of extended human space flight." The Academy's space studies board, in its recent report that was critical of some aspects of NASA's restructuring of the space station, stated, "The space studies board strongly endorses the position that a space-based laboratory is required to study the physiological consequences of long-term space flight." The space station is the ideal means to meet this requirement. The necessity for a space station as a link to our future manned-space projects is clear.

Space station Freedom will provide a world-class life-science and microgravity space-based research laboratory that is unparalleled. The potential for scientific breakthroughs in the medical, biological, metallurgical, materials science, and other fields is extraordinary. Numerous technologies are already being developed and will be advanced by space station Freedom. These include power generation and control, closed loop environmental control, structures and materials robotics, and crew health care. The scientific potential of the station together with the other benefits to be derived from it provides overwhelming justification for its funding.

Japan, the Soviet Union, Canada, and the European Space Agency are committed to long-term manned-space programs. If the United States gives up its position as the acknowledged leader in manned-space efforts, these other nations will be ready to move in to fill this vacuum. Do we really want to give up this major high-technology field that is without equal? I think not. Con-

tinued manned exploration of space, with America as the unquestioned leader, is important to our future and that of our children. We need to complete space station Freedom to keep us in the forefront of the exploration of space.

Space station Freedom is truly an international project. It is a cooperative effort among the United States, Japan, Canada, and the European Space Agency and is the world's largest cooperative science and technology project ever undertaken. There will be considerable cost sharing on this program with our partners. We and our partners have invested significant sums in the development of the station as of this date and are committed to this project. How the United States handles the continued development of space station Freedom will be a gauge to our partners of our ability to be a reliable partner in significant, large-scale science and technology initiatives such as the supercollider and the global-change program. It is important for us to live up to the international agreements we enter into in the science and technology fields.

Our Nation is currently facing a crisis with the scientific literacy of our young people. Science, mathematics, and engineering excellence have emerged as a central goal of education. This trend must continue. A viable, energetic space program extends a challenge to our young people by its very existence. The surge in scientific and technological advancement following our early successes in space is proof of the cause and effect relationship. Space station Freedom will provide a focal point to motivate more young people to study science and engineering. The space station provides the vision and inspiration for future generations of Americans to pursue excellence in education and the expansion of knowledge.

Last year Congress mandated that the space station be restructured to meet certain congressionally imposed requirements. NASA reacted to this mandate swiftly and appropriately. The cost of the station has been reduced, adequate power has been made available for users, the requirements for maintenance and extravehicular activities have been reduced, there is a less ambitious shuttle schedule, and the station will be made available for science research as soon as possible. This restructure was accomplished in cooperation with our international partners and consistent with the recommendations of the Augustine Report. We, in Congress, should not now tell NASA and the Nation that we do not want space station Freedom. I cannot agree with the Appropriations Subcommittee recommendation that space station Freedom be terminated.

This Congress has continuously supported the space station over the last 7

years. Through our legislative process in both Houses of Congress, we have provided the funds to make the dream of a permanently manned presence in outer space a reality. I see no good reason to withdraw any of our support now or in the future.

This issue of deleting funding for the space station is not merely one of changing our space priorities. It is a complete shift away from any space program and the technological investment associated with it. We are talking about abandoning this vital field to the competition. Make no mistake, we are talking about the beginning of the end for the U.S. manned-space program. I will not accept that ending.

The continuation of the manned-space program is consistent with our national goals. As President Kennedy expressed with vision in 1962:

The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join it or not. And it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.

NASA has met the challenge and now we must look to the future. Let us continue to move forward.

□ 1400

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER]. He is a very valuable member of the committee. Even though he is in his first term in Congress, he has mastered the arcane details of the space program in an exceptional way. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and commend him for his contribution.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate very much his establishing this special order on a topic that is so important not only to us in Congress as we direct the policies of the country but to all the American people.

In saying this, we may well be repeating, but I think in repetition we indicate the stress and we indicate the importance and the emphasis that is needed. I concur also with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] said so very eloquently with regard to the need for continuing the funding for the space station.

Again I wish to comment on the statement made by the late President, John F. Kennedy, in 1961. He stood in this House Chamber before a special joint session of Congress, and he firmly seized upon the challenge of this Nation to send a man to the Moon and return him safely to Earth. He told us that "we do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt the gentlewoman from Maryland at this point.

Mrs. MORELLA. Yes indeed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity to indicate one of the visual displays which I think well illustrates the hard choice that President Kennedy made 30 years ago. What we see on that display to my right is a chart of the funding for the Apollo Program as compared to the space station in real dollars. At that point, in 1961, President Kennedy decided to commit this country to the Apollo Program, no matter what the cost, and it cost roughly four times the amount which the space station Freedom is going to cost. We hear about unbalanced space programs from people who are saying today that space station Freedom takes up too much of the budget. We made a commitment in the committee that the space station will never take up more than 20 percent of the NASA budget, and it does not.

□ 1410

Apollo took up something like three-quarters, possibly 80 percent of the NASA budget, at that point. In fact, Apollo was the NASA budget.

At the peak, the expenditure represented roughly 0.8 of 1 percent of the gross national product. The space station will never come even close to that, because the gross national product has increased extremely, so that even using constant dollars, you do not get the right perspective.

The total NASA budget, as recommended by the Augustine Report, was intended to level out at 0.4 of 1 percent, half of what it was at the peak of the Apollo years. I make these points just to illustrate the comment of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] about the difficulty of a decision to commit this share of our Nation's resources to something which, if you want to talk scientific justification, it did not have a scientific justification.

The Soviets learned as much as we did by sending an unmanned rocket to the Moon and bringing back soil samples. Essentially that is all we ever did, was bring back soil samples. But we landed human beings, and we excited the imagination of the entire Earth global population. That is the sort of thing we have at stake today.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we hope we will be able to continue. I think it is very appropriate that the gentleman pointed out these visual aids, along with his commentary, that indicate we are not putting that much into it, and it is imperative that it continue.

Today, 30 years later, as we seek to move forward to implement long-range programs for human exploration of the Moon and the planets, we are once again faced with hard choices. The

NASA Appropriations Subcommittee recently defunded much of the Science Committee's request for the space station Freedom.

I am very concerned that the defunding of the space station will cause, in its totality, a severe impact. The Augustine Committee stated that "If the United States is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element." NASA's loss of such a long-term goal for the manned space program will be deeply felt.

The cancellation of the space station program also endangers our international cooperative agreements with our space partners. Each of our partners has indicated that cancellation would make future cooperation on any large-scale international science and technology venture highly unlikely for a considerable period of time.

That was articulated earlier by one of the Members who pointed out, as did the gentleman from Alabama, time and time again we begin to lose our credibility in terms of international cooperation and agreement. Our agreements do not mean much.

The Japanese have already put approximately \$300 million into their part of the space station, and they have indicated that they may well remove their desire to engage in other major scientific projects with the United States if we do not mean what we say.

The European Space Agency has called the space station the cornerstone of the European Space Agency's long-term space effort. The Canadian Space Agency, of course, has also contacted us, urging that we continue funding.

These are just part of the international agreements and cooperation that we have already engaged in, and we will, if this is not funded, be removing ourselves with incredible impact from so many other projects with these countries.

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, the defunding of the space station will have a severe rippling effect upon our Nation's economy. The space station program has a procurement constituency of over 2,000 businesses in 40 States, employing over 50,000 workers. I am proud to represent a great number of those workers' some of whom have committed their careers to developing a space station.

Mr. Speaker, due to the appropriations procedure, NASA is in the unenviable task of competing with some very important social programs. Consequently, we, in Congress, are faced with the hard choices of funding investments in the future or addressing current needs. When the time comes for us to cast our votes on the space station, I urge all of my colleagues to give every consideration for allowing

NASA to continue the rich tradition of our space program.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her contribution. It is extremely helpful. As she indicated, we will need to raise those points over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, this is sort of a dress rehearsal for our debate on Thursday. I hope the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] will be equally eloquent when that time comes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], a very active member of the committee, and one who is thoroughly familiar with the nuts and bolts of the space program, including the space station.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our fine colleagues, Mr. BROWN, chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and Mr. WALKER, the ranking Republican, for reserving this time to discuss the future of the American Space Program.

Part of that future, Mr. Speaker, must be an American space station.

It is no coincidence that the creation and growth of America's Information Age, fueled by our high-technology industries, have paralleled the years of NASA's greatest activity and accomplishment.

Space exploration has been one of our best public policy vehicles for boosting our economy, enhancing our international competitiveness, improving our national security, and improving our quality of life.

But just as it was more than 30 years ago, when Newsweek editor Kermit Lansner warned of the brain drain born of delays and ignorance, today the United States risks the loss of all that we have achieved in our space program if we delay the construction of space station Freedom any further.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, it has been my privilege for many years to work with NASA and help shape our Nation's space program.

I have attended countless hearings and listened to countless hours of testimony on space station Freedom.

During these hearings, I have become convinced that space station Freedom is a necessity, not a luxury.

The space station is a building block to a true new world order that will include continued exploration of space and eventually, a permanent human presence in space.

I have voted, along with a majority of the members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, to authorize funding for the space station.

I have voted, along with a majority of Members of the House of Representatives, to authorize funding for the space station Freedom.

But now, Mr. Speaker, funding for space station Freedom has been vetoed.

It has not been vetoed by the House. It has not been vetoed by the Senate. It has not been vetoed by the President.

It has been vetoed by an appropriations subcommittee that had only a few hours to consider what had been years in the making.

Mr. Speaker, legislating on an appropriations bill is an age-old debate here in the House. The subcommittee technically has not done that with their cleverly drawn provisions.

But the actions by the Appropriations subcommittee demonstrate clearly the dangers of that practice are now out of control.

Mr. Speaker, housing is important. Education and veteran's programs and health care are all important.

So, too, is the exploration of space.

I believe there is no substitute for making choices about our space program and then moving ahead to make those choices work in our national interest.

This is what the Science, Space, and Technology Committee did.

This is what this House did when it voted for the space station.

Mr. Speaker, an entire generation has now matured since Neil Armstrong took his first historic steps on the Moon.

An entire generation has never known a day when it was beyond the ability of this Nation to send men and women into space and return them safely to the Earth.

That, ironically, seems to be part of the problem today.

Space exploration is mistakenly viewed by too many Americans either as routine or as a past glory. It is neither.

In the days of the Apollo program, the drive to explore space and reach the Moon was partly a result of the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Today, the space race is one of economic and scientific competition—and less and less one with geopolitical or even military overtones.

The lesson and legacy throughout American history is that much of our prosperity has come about through hard-won technological advances.

But our space program is not about hardware, it is about where this Nation will go and what it will do with the resource of outer space.

I believe that we cannot be content to abandon the centerpiece of our future space program and watch other nations overtake us in space exploration.

In its report to Congress several months ago, the well-respected Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program, the so-called Augustine Committee, agreed.

The Augustine Committee also concluded that the most significant feature of the space station involves re-

search to determine how human physiology functions in space.

Space station Freedom will be an international laboratory and serve as a stepping stone toward further exploration of this planet and our solar system.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to live in space, biotechnology and life sciences must be developed far beyond their present capabilities. This is the most critical contribution to be made by the space station: Life sciences experimentation.

Continued space exploration necessitates strong life sciences research to ensure the health of crew members.

Humans must be able to adapt to the microgravity, radiation, and isolation of, say, a permanent settlement on the Moon, or a manned mission to Mars.

Mr. Speaker, no matter where our space efforts are focused—toward Earth, toward our solar system, or toward the universe beyond—the ultimate goals of the space program will always remain to improve the human condition.

Perhaps it is this point which best justifies space station Freedom.

How can we even consider short-changing future generations of Americans by ignoring the vast opportunities of space exploration?

The answer is, I don't believe we can, and why we must restore the funding for space station Freedom.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the point of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] in the chart to the left, we have a comparison of the R&D investments or expenditures as a percentage of GNP by country, showing the great lead that Japan and West Germany hold for investments in R&D as a total. That includes defense R&D.

Looking only at civilian or nondefense R&D, the chart on the right is even more striking, because it shows that not only is the United States below Japan and West Germany, but, if I am not incorrect, below France, and possibly even the United Kingdom, as a result of the fact that more than half of our R&D expenditures are military.

□ 1420

Mr. MINETA. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for this time and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for taking this time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his important contribution. As I said earlier to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], I trust that this is just a warmup for when we get into our debate on Thursday and that the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] will have more extensive remarks at that time in which we can explore this further.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to alternate the parties here. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for yielding time to me. I was struck during the comments by the gentleman from Alabama of something we need to remind ourselves of every now and then. A program as complicated as the space station may provoke some disagreement among Members of this body. The particular point that the gentleman made with which I do not agree is that the reconstructed, reconstituted space station Freedom has adequate sources of energy, of power. I happen to know that this is something that concerns the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and concerns me and that we have expressed our interest in this subject to NASA and have suggested strongly to them that they should be looking to alternative sources of electrical generation, such as solar dynamic power.

To date, NASA has chosen to reject our nontechnical but nonetheless brilliant expertise, and we will continue to discuss this with them. This by no means indicates that we are not committed to the continuation of manned exploration of space and to the space station.

I think that word "commitment" is what we are probably talking about here today. I have the very definite feeling that over the course of the past 10 months or so, culminating in the conflict in the Persian Gulf, that the American people rediscovered the concept of commitment, rediscovered the fact that we are a technologically superior Nation, that we can establish goals and we can go out and we can meet them and that we can overcome challenges and obstacles.

I think that they expect us to reflect that new found spirit of commitment that our constituents, the people of this country, believe and feel. I honestly think that the country itself, as a whole, is committed, is committed to the space station, is committed to the continued manned exploration of space. I think they also agree that when the United States makes a commitment to another country, that we should live up to it. And I am disappointed a little bit at the reaction of some of our colleagues to the expressions of concern by Canada and Japan and our European partners about our apparent wavering in our commitment to work with them to produce space station Freedom.

I have heard reactions that indicate that some of our colleagues feel that these nations are threatening us in some way. They are not threatening us; they are reminding us that we made agreements with them, that we made commitments to them that we would be a partner in this grand venture to

establish a manned platform for the exploration of space.

□ 1430

We should not look askance at countries that call to our attention our commitments, because we do that constantly right here in the well of this House in terms far more bellicose than the language that was used by our partners in expressing their concern about our wavering commitment to the space station.

I for one do not believe that our commitment is wavering. I for one do not believe that the people of this country are wavering in their commitment to the continued excellence of the United States in technology and in space exploration, and I believe that when we have the appropriate opportunity, the people of this House of Representatives will accurately reflect the deep desire of the people of this country to maintain our leadership in space.

I look forward to that opportunity, and I hope it comes sooner, not later, because our partners in the rest of the world need to have demonstrated to them forcefully and immediately that this country is committed and we are a good partner and we are going forward with manned exploration.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his very important contribution. We need to explore this issue of the impact of the space station on our relationships with our allies in much greater detail than we may have time to do, and it is very appropriate that we should bring it up here.

I think the gentleman would agree with me that not only does it endanger our relationships with regard to the space station but we are constantly hearing a chorus of voices that all big science ought to be international and cooperative and that if we cannot establish a basis on the space station, then we will not have a basis on the superconducting super collider or the human genome project or the Earth exploration-observation program, all of which are programs based upon international cooperation, and if we felt that we needed that in order to be able to finance them, how precarious is our position when we do not have the partners that we would need to carry out these very important global programs in the future.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], not a member of the committee and, therefore, we doubly appreciate his contribution at this point, and we hope to involve many more noncommittee members in this debate on Thursday when the issue comes up.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I came here for the purpose of correcting the record and became fascinated in the discussion.

As the gentleman pointed out, I am not a member of this committee, but I have often thought about the topic that is being discussed here this afternoon and would like to make some remarks beginning with a paraphrase of some wise man of years past who said that it is each generation's responsibility not only to chart the new frontiers left it by its forefathers and not only to discover its own frontiers, but it is also the responsibility of every generation to lead its children to the edge of the unknown wood and say, "Now, press you on." It sounds both stirring and quaint. It sounds a little old-fashioned, because as everyone knows, we do not have any frontiers anymore.

Perhaps when John Kennedy said we will go to the Moon and when we achieved that is the last time that the imagination of all of mankind was captured by exploration. Oh, some say we have frontiers in the sea and some say we have frontiers in social programs and some say we have frontiers in art and so forth and so on, and all of that is true. But the term "frontier" is not used precisely in the same way, and I would suggest perhaps does not have the same compelling force to mankind that a real, honest-to-goodness frontier that needs to be discovered and explored can provide.

Other nations in centuries past have been nations of explorers, Scandinavia, England, Spain, and France, and many, many others. Ours, too, although I think we tend to think of ours more as a nation of pioneers, both exploring and settling.

But I have often wondered how important the concept of a frontier, of new worlds, of places where no man has been, how important that concept is to our perception of the role of mankind in this universe, to mankind's concept of himself, of mankind's concepts of the role and purpose here and toward our very own future. That sounds a little flaky perhaps, but let me give an example of how something that we all take for granted can have an enormous impact on concepts.

I was meeting with some young people, and young people, by that I mean people in their late twenties and early thirties, a hard group, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] would agree, to get together with. They do not tend to join the Kiwanis Club like older people used to and so forth, and they were there with what they called the rug rats, the children that were crawling around as we held our meeting. We began to discuss things, and I discovered something that I had never before realized, a concept between my generation and theirs.

My wife and I, when we were married, knew we could buy a home whenever we wanted to. It was a matter of getting the downpayment together. And these young people believe that if they had not bought a home already they would never have the opportunity to do so.

My purpose now is not here to argue whether or not they were correct in that belief, although clearly it has become much more difficult in these days for young people to purchase a home than it used to be. My point is, rather, that if you remove that concept from the mind of young people, you also change a whole lot about their attitudes toward the world they live in, their attitudes toward what limits they may face as they move in the world, limits on what they can provide for their children, the simple idea that, as so many of us in our middle age took for granted, home ownership is not one that many of our young people have, and it changes their attitude toward their options. If that simple concept has any validity, then is it not worth considering at this juncture with this issue of the space station not only the arguments we have heard about our commitments to other nations and not only the costs and not only the scientific gains that can be lost, but also is it not worthy of some consideration what this program does?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my support for the space station Freedom program as requested in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget submission. The space station is of vital importance to maintaining the United States' role as a world leader in advanced technology, research and manned space exploration. Although I understand the budget constraints that faced members of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies subcommittee, I believe it would be a mistake to terminate funding for the space station. We should all be aware of the many benefits we as a nation will receive as a direct result of continued support for the space station.

Space station Freedom is a vital initiative which is fundamental to the United States' goal of expanding the exploration of the final frontier. As President Kennedy stressed in his address to Congress in 1961 following the launch of sputnik by the Soviets, there was a clear need for a firm commitment by the Nation to new courses in the manned United States space program. To remain competitive in this arena required dedication and discipline in research and development. By focusing our momentum and commitment, we were able to regain technical and scientific superiority and land a man on the Moon. We must take the same approach today. We must push forward to develop and deploy a manned, orbiting research facility so that the United States will lead the world in space exploration.

But there is much more than national pride at stake. As the flagship of the U.S. civilian space program, space station Freedom is a critical element in strengthening our nation's global competitiveness and technology base. In addition to providing critical microgravity

and life sciences research capability that will benefit health care on Earth, the station will contribute to advances in new technologies such as robotics, high speed computers, lightweight alloys, high-accuracy navigation, and rocket propulsion, among many others. By establishing intensive research and development programs, Space station Freedom will allow the United States to dramatically push back the high technology frontiers of science and engineering and significantly improve the existence of mankind well into the next century. This is a crucial step in finding a world where all people can flourish.

Beyond the technical benefits derived from the program, the space station will also serve as a source of inspiration to American youth to achieve excellence in education. If the United States hopes to remain at the forefront of high technology research and manufacturing, we must encourage our students to expand their knowledge in the areas of math, science and engineering. The United States currently faces a crisis in these areas as the number of bachelor of science and Ph.D. science degrees earned has declined since 1986. The number of doctoral degrees awarded to Americans has fallen from 2,400 per year in the early 1970's to 1,300 per year recently. Overall, projected shortfalls in Ph.D. and bachelor of science degrees are expected to number 78,000 and 675,000 respectively by the year 2006. Between 1982 and 1987, the percentage of college freshmen who planned to pursue engineering degrees dropped from 22 to 17 percent for men and from 4 to 3 percent for women. Overall interest in pursuing degrees in computer science majors declined from 4 percent in 1982 to 2 percent in 1987. What message would we send to these young people if we kill the space station? The space station Freedom program should serve as a focal point to motivate young Americans to pursue degrees in science and engineering, and will serve as a symbol of our country's commitment to achieving excellence in education.

I support continued funding of the space station Freedom program because it will assure U.S. leadership in space. It is important for us as a nation to rise to the challenges before us now as we did some 30 years ago. There were, and will continue to be, many domestic concerns that must be addressed. But we must retain our vision for the future because it is that ambitious pursuit of leadership and excellence that will provide the momentum for us as a nation to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. Space station Freedom will serve as a symbol of American dedication and competitive spirit. Leadership in space exploration means world leadership in education, competitiveness, and high technology. We simply cannot afford to compromise our Nation's leading role in these vital areas. Space station Freedom is a critical element of America's future as we look toward the 21st century, and I urge my colleagues to support continued funding for the space station Freedom program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise the gentleman that the time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington is making a very important statement and one that I think is very worthwhile for us to have completed, so I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding the time, and I am almost completed.

The point I was making was that if the concept of whether or not you are able to own a home can have a very substantial impact on your psychology, on how you look at the world, then should we not, in considering this issue, also consider what this program, this space station, does in terms of that attitude of discovering new frontiers for ourselves and our children to chart, and what this program does in the way of offering an opportunity for us to lead our children to the edge of the unknown wood where we can say, "Now, press you on?"

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is an excellent statement. Because much of what we are talking about when we are talking about the space station or the space program is the risks of the unknown and what we benefit from moving out to unknown frontiers and taking the risks necessary in order to pursue our options there.

I think the gentleman has made a very important statement, because history tells us that some of the nations who came up to those frontiers and refused to move on to them were also nations that ended up failing. In fact, it was the British statesman Disraeli to whom the quote is attributed when he said that men move from bondage to faith, from faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, from abundance to complacency, from complacency to dependency, and from dependency back to bondage.

1440

Nations continued to move in that direction, too. In my mind, when we talk about the space program, we are talking about courage. We are talking about that element of our Nation where we have been fortunate. Our faith has led the United States to freedom. Our freedom has led the United States to a great deal of courage. That is producing an abundance like none that the world has ever seen, but if we do not have the courage to continue at the frontiers, if we do not pursue those options we will, in fact, become complacent, dependent, and ultimately see

our people move back toward bondage. That is what this is all about.

I think the gentleman helped put it into a lot of perspective. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I'm happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority leader of the committee in speaking out concerning the merits of the space station which is under, as we all know, jeopardy.

I do not think it is something that cannot be worked out. I hope that the individuals who have some control are not sealed in cement.

I wanted to speak extemporaneously a little bit about the program in general, because I think perhaps we do not realize what the space program in general, and the space station specifically, has meant and will mean to the future of our country and, indeed, the world.

In the late 1950's, I recall being in a chemistry class and hearing the news that the Soviet Union had developed sputnik. I remember President Eisenhower indicating that we could not afford not to compete in civilian space programs with the Soviet Union, and thus the harmony and the pursuit of the space technology in full gear got under way, as I recall it anyway.

Americans have always been known for their spirit of adventure. We are the frontierspeople in many ways in varieties of technology. Through the years we have seen so many advances. I think they are advances that the American people and indeed perhaps some people in Congress are not aware of. They are not aware of what space exploration has meant to our country and to the world. There is not one area, I do not think, that we live in, one type of area that relates to our quality of life that does not relate to some spin-off from the space program, from the clothes that we wear, the insulation of our homes. Think of the people in this country who are homebound, who cannot get out, and who need to count on the preservation of food. That is technology. Simple things that were developed as result of this space program.

Think of your loved ones who may have had ambulatory cataract surgery. Years ago a person would have to spend weeks in a hospital if they wanted to have cataract surgery. Today, so many older Americans and others go in, have the surgery performed, and come back out the same day. The success of that type of operation, which was developed through the wonderful heart and soul of the space program, is something that so many Americans, I know, are grateful for. Laser surgery, which is the technology that is being developed and has been developed; nuclear medicine; the purification of medicines and

pharmaceuticals in space. These are things that we would not purify on Earth for a variety of reasons. There is satellite television. The satellite programs that were developed with respect to the weather monitoring that we are so aware of. These are all byproducts. The list goes on and on.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman will allow me to reclaim my time, I want to emphasize the point that the gentlewoman is making with a quote that I think bears on the point about how well our aged have benefited from the space program.

Back when John F. Kennedy made his famous speech in which he committed this Nation to going to the Moon within the next decade, it was about this time of year. It was May 25, 1961, just about 30 years ago as we speak, that he made that speech. There was reaction to the speech. Some of our colleagues at that time reacted in ways which indicated this might not be such a good idea. They thought there were other things that we ought to be doing. I have a quote from a Congressman from Minnesota who said, "It is important, of course"—meaning the race to the Moon—"but it has to be kept in perspective. There are lots of things to do like taking care of the aged." He was absolutely right, but I wonder if he had any idea what that race to the Moon was going to mean for the aged? That, in fact, his statement was a proposal related to the amount of money we are going to spend in a variety of government programs, but he had absolutely no idea what the end result would be, as the gentlewoman has pointed out.

The gentlewoman did not mention things like heart pacemakers, and monitoring equipment. We now have people able to live quality lives in their homes because of monitoring equipment that can be kept there with them, and they do not have to be institutionalized. All of that comes out of the space program, and has improved the quality of life of older people enormously as the result of what we did in the space program.

Had we not made the investment, had we said that this was something we cannot afford to do right now, if we said that 30 years ago, then we would not have the benefits today, and we would not have had to press the frontiers in order to get those products developed.

So the gentlewoman is absolutely right on target in what she is saying, that across the whole spectrum of American life we have been the beneficiaries of the commitment we made to the Apollo program. We will continue to be the beneficiaries as far as we are willing to make further commitments such as the space program.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I will ask the page to put up two additional charts. These two additional charts show the decline relative to our opposition of our investments in research and development.

Now, the next two charts dramatize a couple of the effects of this reduction. Let me explain just briefly what they are.

On the left is a chart that shows our decline in balance of trade to the first in the non-high-technology areas, and then beginning in about 1984 or 1985 in the high technologies areas, which went negative for the first time in 1986. On the other chart we have a chart that shows the relative number of scientists and engineers engaged in R&D for 10,000 of our labor force, and here where the United States has always led, and this chart ends in 1986, it shows the Japanese as passing the United States in 1986. If we carry that out for 3 or 4 more years up to the present, the charts are even more impressive because it shows not only is Japan passing the United States, but West Germany is passing the United States.

It is the evidence that our drop in investments is affecting our trade balance and the number of people working in these areas that is threatening the continued advance in these various areas that the gentlewoman has pointed out. The NASA Program, which would be mortally struck by the ending of the space station accounts for more than half of our Government investments in civilian R&D. That is why it is so important that we keep in mind what this will do to our posture in the world in terms of trade balance and the number of trained people doing scientific and technological work.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from California is absolutely right. Of course, there have been two studies that have shown what the Apollo Program paid back. One study was done immediately after the Apollo Program ended in 1972, and another one done in the early 1980's, to look at the space program from that period of time on. Both studies show that the payback was 9 to 1 to our gross national product.

So if we look at it in pure economic terms, we have, as a result of the development of new projects, gotten a major payback to our gross national product.

As the gentleman from California points out, also it has improved our trade balance. It has done remarkable things in terms of improving our R&D posture in the world. All of that has been a major benefit growing directly out of the space program which, as the gentleman points out, we will lose, perhaps irrevocably, if the space station is not pursued, and we do not take the next step in space.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

□ 1450

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding further to me.

First, let me express my delight at the gentleman's eloquence and erudition. It is truly outstanding, and then I want to point out that these charts were not concocted in my office. These are merely duplicates of the science indicator chart prepared by the National Science Foundation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Now I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I think this is very interesting. You know, we always learn from each other, do we not?

I think the point of the chairman about the number of scientists and engineers, and we are always saying we want our young people to go into the math, science, and computer technology areas; as a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, in the Northeast-Midwest region, the Lewis Research Center is located in Cleveland, which is a wonderful research center devoted to NASA. It has been in existence, it is celebrating its 50th anniversary. One of the wonderful things about it is that 9 Ohio institutions of higher learning, along with 17 corporations, are now forming this consortium so that young people can literally take their classes right at Lewis and learn the sciences and computer technology and engineering hand in hand with our dedicated civil servants and those who are on contracts in the private sector, and to think this may be jeopardized for our region, to me I think is so sad.

Mr. WALKER. The gentlewoman also knows that around the country we are developing what is known as Challenger Centers, based on the Space Shuttle *Challenger*, which met such a tragic end; but the Challenger Centers are aimed at doing the same thing, bringing young people into a place where they see the space program and have a real hands-on ability to work with it, and they are working with shuttles, working with space station mockups, and it is something where young people become extremely excited about the future that is available to them.

In fact, there is a story told about the Challenger Center out here at Alexandria that the President's wife visited the other day. Mrs. Bush was out there and she was introduced to a young lady who was working at a console. They thought the young lady would be thrilled to meet the President's wife, and the young lady turned around and she said, "Oh, Mrs. Bush, it's very nice to meet you, but I'm sorry, I have to continue to work here. I have a crew that is in trouble out in space."

Mrs. Bush when they left said, "Well, that is one of the most dedicated young people I have ever seen."

The point being this was somebody who was absolutely enthralled with what they were doing. We are able to produce that level of excitement because young people intuitively understand that the space frontier is their future. They operate on a level that we sometimes do not wholly understand, because they are projecting out many years ahead of where we will be.

If we lose the space station, we will lose the ability to tell those young people that we have committed to their future in a way that assures them of the ability to live and work in space.

I think it will be tragic for what the Challenger Centers are trying to accomplish, what the Lewis Space Center and others of our Space Centers are trying to accomplish and what education as a whole is trying to portray to young people as being the real excitement that exists for them on the space frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield further to the gentlewoman.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for that addition, because it is true that there are all these other centers. I know in Alabama they have a fabulous center for young people to take these classes at their institute. One of the heartening things was to see individual young people who are in the eighth and ninth grades, mostly minorities, take advantage of these seminars and institutes that they have for youngsters in elementary and high school areas as well.

Just finally, I would like to direct my attention just for a minute or two on what to me this space station means. It is a laboratory in space. I think sometimes we call it by the wrong name. It is going to be a lab in space.

For anyone who is an environmentalist, for example, and really cares about the layers and layers of products surrounding our Earth that produce what some scientists call the greenhouse effect, for any individual who is interested in the ozone depletion that is facing our planet, I do not see how you can be opposed to the space station when the scientists will be able to really focus in on those environmental problems.

I feel confident they are going to find solutions by taking a look from that laboratory at Earth and figure out ways in which we can address this enormous problem, not only in our country, but certainly throughout the world.

For anyone who is interested in finding an end to world hunger, how can we not want to know and be able to predict agricultural production throughout the world which people who are manning that space laboratory will be able to view from that lab and take a

look at where the pockets of world hunger are and what we can do agriculturally in fulfilling the needs of the global community.

For anyone like myself who is interested in finding a cure for diseases, is interested in medical research like finding a cure for cancer or diabetes or various forms of heart disease, and the list goes on and on, how can you be opposed to a laboratory in space where scientists have told us that one of the areas where we can truly study immunology and purified pharmaceuticals is in that type of atmosphere.

I think the practicality of this station, let alone the fact that our sense of competitiveness and our sense of wanting to have an economic and technological base for our country's future makes it just imperative that we save this program.

Let me tell you, I know for those of you on the Science and Technology Committee, led by these two gentlemen who have done such outstanding work in this area over the years, I know that many of us do not realize that gutting the space station guts the core of the NASA Program. It is the next step in the program. To take it away is to take away, in my judgment, the program itself.

I feel strongly that while we have engaged in international scientific research experiments with other countries, and we have commitments with other countries, the fact is that the United States of America is the leader in space exploration.

The Japanese, the French and others, are frankly waiting in the wings to become the leader in that technology. I know we are cooperating with them now and so on, but we are the leader and they are the followers.

I think it is just terrible, it would be tragic and terrible for the future of our country's high technology and industrial base if we gave up what has been one of our greatest claims to fame.

So for the sake of the quality of life of our own people, let alone the global community, I hope that Congress in its wisdom will reject what has taken place in one of the subcommittees, one little subcommittee zeroing out a whole program that relates to the future of our country.

I want to compliment these two gentlemen for having this special order and I urge all Americans who feel this is important to call their Members of Congress and to tell them they do not want an end to this wonderful program that has meant so much to the quality of life of the American people.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement. Just to build on a couple things the gentlewoman has said a moment ago, which I think is important for the American people to understand, that a lot of this goes well beyond even what our imaginations allow us to dream.

I had some scientists in my office awhile back. When you talk about what can be done in medicine aboard spacecraft; what they are looking at doing is growing new nerve tissue in space. The reason that is important, when you grow nerve tissue on Earth, gravity distorts it. The reason why they were looking at growing this in space was they felt what they could ultimately do was grow new optic nerves in a space laboratory.

□ 1500

And that they would be able thereby to cure blindness. They were able to dream even beyond that to say that if we can grow optic nerves, we think maybe at some point we can grow spinal columns and cure some forms of paraplegia.

And now imagine what the world looks like if you begin to understand that some of those opportunities are available to us. The gentlelady is absolutely right, this is a laboratory. Beyond that, though, it is something else; it is a permanent presence in lower orbit.

No frontier is conquered until you establish a permanent presence on that frontier. Other than that, you have just visited.

Now you may have learned something important by visiting it, but in the Apollo Program we visited the Moon; we never established a permanent presence there. So, therefore, our learning curve ended when we came back from the Moon and did not go back.

One of the things that is absolutely essential to the space program is to establish a permanent presence in low Earth orbit, which allows us to learn things that we do not expect to learn, that we do not have any reason to learn. Some of the things the gentlewoman mentioned about the environment and so on, some of our critics will claim that we can do all of those things robotically. Well, the problem with robots is robots can only do those things that we already know should be done. We can program for the things that we expect them to see. What you cannot do is you cannot program robots to find the unexpected.

The fact is that much of what we may want to learn about the Earth from orbit are things that only man, with his ability to evaluate, will be able to understand.

By establishing a permanent presence in space for men and women to monitor the Earth, we may in fact learn much more than our robots ever were able to tell us.

So, the gentlewoman is right on target. There are so many aspects of this program that it is difficult to understand why anyone would be shortsighted enough to believe that a mere cancellation of this program somehow

gets you better science in the future, as some of them have claimed.

It just does not add up when you understand the total nature of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Before the gentlewoman leaves, would she be kind enough to listen to a few compliments?

Ms. OAKAR. I would love to.

Mr. BROWN. I think her remarks are extremely important in focusing on the research capabilities of the space station because this has become a major issue. The criticism from some people in the scientific community is that the research facilities, which are basically life science and materials research, in neither area are as good as they should be and they do not justify the investment in the space station. I cannot argue with that.

They are not perfect, and they probably do not justify it, and we should not seek to have it justified on the basis of the research. But let me tell you what will happen. Both the Japanese and the Germans are partners and intend to provide for the space station these laboratory facilities a materials laboratory and, of course, I think all of them expect to benefit from the life sciences research with regard to man in space.

I will tell you what will happen if we cancel: They will go ahead on their own. And those rapidly growing German and Japanese pharmaceutical and other scientific enterprises that are already seeking to get ahead of us will move ahead with their own space modules launched in their own spacecraft, and they will not share the results with us as they would if they were partners with us in this space station. And those curves that you see there showing our decline in high technology and in the number of people involved in science and engineering will continue to plunge dramatically.

So it is very important that we focus on the point the gentlewoman has made.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman from California would allow me to reclaim my time for just a moment, you know those folks who talk about the fact that better science can be done elsewhere and that we ought not invest the money this way, they have been with us for a long time. I have a quote here from a New York Times article right after the Kennedy speech was made to which I was referring before. The New York Times at that point reported, and I quote:

Many influential scientists, including some on the President's Science Advisory Committee, have argued that the cost of a manned trip, estimated to run as high as \$40 billion over ten years, could be more profitably spent in other areas of research and education on Earth.

I wonder if those same scientists, if we went back and interviewed them today, would be willing to say those things. You might find a few, but the fact is that most of them would have to acknowledge at this point that the learning curve from the manned mission more than made up for the \$40 billion in expenditure. In fact, it was leveraged into hundreds of billions of dollars worth of science and new economic growth for this country. But there were skeptics at the time that we were proceeding forward just as we have skeptics today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BACCHUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of building space station Freedom. As my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have said and as my constituents in central Florida know, there is much more at stake here than merely the funding of one scientific project. At stake is the fundamental character of our Nation. Throughout our history, we Americans have been foremost among the world's pioneers, even resolved to expand the frontiers of geography and knowledge. Our decision about whether to build the space station offers us a clear choice: Do we continue pioneering or do we abdicate that role because we lack the will to confront our budget deficits and the challenges they have created? Will we push on to the next frontier or will we throw our hands up, turn away from the future, and say that we simply can't afford to be explorers anymore?

I say we must continue to pioneer. We must continue to seek the next frontier. We must continue to be explorers. We must seize the future.

Mr. Speaker, space station Freedom is the next vital stepping stone for our space program, one just as important as Explorer, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and the space shuttle. Without Freedom, we may no longer have a manned space program. Without Freedom, we might have to forget our dreams of building a permanent base on the Moon and landing a human being on Mars. We know of no other way to conduct the life sciences research that will tell us what long-term exposure to the harsh environment of space does to the human body.

Some question whether we need a manned space program at all. They say we can get more for our money scientifically by spending it on unmanned platforms and observational satellites. But how do you put a price on the return from the human experience of exploring space? How do you put a price on the character of a country that is willing and able to lead the world toward tomorrow. As Mr. WALKER said, "How do we explore the unknown if we rely solely on machines that know only what we know?"

I can do no better than the late writer Henry Fairlie in comparing exploration by instruments and exploration by humans. He asked:

Do we think of a machine called a telescope gazing at the stars, or do we think of Galileo gazing at them and dreaming of a brighter future? Do we think more of the three small ships that crossed the Atlantic in 1492, or do we think more of Columbus, almost driven to madness by his quest for new worlds? Do we think of the *Spirit of St. Louis*, or do we think of Lindbergh sitting in the cockpit, daring to do what no one thought possible?

It is not enough just to have the machines and the platforms and the satellites. We need the Galileos, the Columbuses, and the Lindberghs of tomorrow. We need the vision and the courage to build space station Freedom, and create a greater destiny for all mankind.

For those who demand practical economic benefits here on Earth, I am confident that space station Freedom will produce them—in abundance. Nine dollars have been returned to our gross national product for every \$1 we have invested in space. This figure cannot be cited too often. Space exploration has given us weather satellites, communications satellites, programmable pacemakers, programmable implants for diabetics, and other wondrous technology. Space exploration has given us better insulations and new materials for better homes, buildings, and aircraft. Space exploration has inspired countless children to study and become scientists, engineers, and doctors. More than ever, our children need that inspiration today.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving this country as a trade negotiator some years ago. I understand the components of our trade balance and, as members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology fully understand, one of the few areas in which we continue to lead the world is space and aerospace. We have a \$26 billion trade surplus in aerospace. Do we really want to throw that away?

There is at least one certainty, if we do not build a space station, someone else will. The Japanese and the Germans are willing to follow our lead and contribute to our space station, but if we do not build Freedom, they will build their own space station. They will enjoy the benefits of all that spin-off technology and international competitiveness while we might be permitted to rent some space from them from time to time. Is that the future we want for America in space? Mr. Speaker, I recognize we have many pressing needs on Earth, from cleaning up the environment to building veterans hospitals to providing affordable housing. But it is simply a false choice to say we have no choice between meeting those needs any paying for the space station. What we need is the leadership and commitment to make

the real choices, choices that will enable us to invest in the raw materials of our future.

□ 1510

As my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], pointed out so eloquently in the Chamber last week, the challenges we face today are no greater than years ago when President Kennedy challenged the Nation to send a man to the Moon by the end of the decade. We had a budget deficit then. We faced a budget deficit then, we faced a grave threat from the Soviet Union, we were in the initial stages of a long conflict in Vietnam. The civil rights movement challenged us to end the shameful history of discrimination. Mr. Speaker, we faced those and many other challenges then, and we went to the Moon anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see why today we cannot face our domestic challenges and build a space station as well. Do we have the courage? Do we have the will? What would Galileo do? What would Columbus do? What would Lindbergh do? What would Jack Kennedy do? Most important and most urgent, what will we do? Will we seize the future? Will we shape the future, or will we be shaped by the future in ways we may not like?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] for his statement, and it is an eloquent statement, and it is interesting. He makes the point that we have always been a Nation of pioneers, and we sometimes think back, that our forefathers did all this pioneering, and there was no real criticism of what they were doing, that they just kind of proceeded on, and we are the beneficiaries of that. The fact is that much of that pioneering and of that exploration on the frontier was criticized along the way.

The former Librarian of Congress, the eminent historian, Daniel Boorstin, wrote some years ago in a book called "The Americans: the National Experience," about the Louisiana Purchase, and it may seem rather ludicrous to us at the present time, but the Louisiana Purchase was indeed controversial. It was, and in fact some of the language used against the Louisiana Purchase at the time was language much like the people who are talking here in the Congress against the space station.

Let me just quote for my colleagues from Boorstin here at one point. He says:

When the Treaty was brought to the United States, the response was "less exuberance than fear. . . . Some eastern businessmen had already begun to fear the westward drain of their capital resources. A quarter century later their fears were still alive, when Secretary of the Treasury Richard Rush warned, 'The manner in which the remote lands of the United States are selling and settling, whilst it may tend to increase more the population of the country, . . . does not increase

capital in the same proportion. . . . the creation of capital is retarded, rather than accelerated, by the diffusion of a thin population over a great surface of soil. Anything that may serve to hold back this tendency * * * can scarcely prove otherwise than salutary."

Well, in other words, I mean, as my colleagues know, hold it back, do not let people go west and so on because it is draining our capital resources. How ridiculous. What we now understand 150 years later is it did not drain the capital resources, it created new capital resources. It created new wealth, and that wealth helped the growth of this country beyond all understanding.

The fact is that space is exactly the same way. Space is even more likely to produce great wealth because it is absolutely boundless, and so we are bound to learn far more out there, and the fact is that capital is not finite. It is endlessly expanding, and our ability to do the great social work that we want to do as a nation depends upon our ability to be able to expand capital, to expand opportunity and create the wealth that will allow us to serve the poor, and that is why pioneering has always been so important to us. But it has always been controversial as well, and some people have to stand back and say, "The critics are wrong. In the case of the space station the critics are wrong. They don't recognize that this is an investment in the future, and they instead want to do it only on the dollar calculation in today's terms."

Mr. Speaker, that makes no sense.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, "Thank you." You are absolutely right, and you have chosen an excellent example to add further to that reflection in the Louisiana Purchase. I think it is significant that the President who made that decision was Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson was always someone who believed that it was likely that democracy would best be able to succeed only in a small geographical terrain, so he took a great risk in believing that in doubling the domain of democracy he could double the potential of democracy.

I just finished reading the book: "Thomas Jefferson, Scientist," about Thomas Jefferson and his scientific avocations, which were many, and I believe he was willing to take that risk in doubling the size of this country and exploring the unknown because he did have the understanding of this basic importance of science and exploring to all human endeavors. He knew that the future could be boundless if we allowed it to be so, and so he was willing to take a chance that the future of democracy could be boundless as well.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS]. He is absolutely right, and that

is what we are engaged in here, taking chances. It does take courage, but the Bible says that, and I am paraphrasing, that the nation without vision is lost. We are, in fact, in that kind of time period if we in fact do not have the vision and the courage to go forward.

Mr. BROWN. May I add briefly an additional example to the one given by the gentleman? I am sure he is familiar with it. That is the acquisition of Alaska, which in many ways people thought resembled the Moon in terms of its barrenness and its lack of resources, and in that great debate, which I well remember, it was referred to as Seward's Folly, and many people objected strongly to our expanding the United States to this barren northern terrain which has now become one of the sources of resources for this Nation and one which is indispensable to our future.

So, that typical attitude that resists exploring new frontiers could be exhibited in numerous other ways, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the point of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is an excellent one.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very supportive of our space station program, and I hope that my colleagues will recognize the value of our research and development investment in the space station.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I am going to approach this from a different perspective because I have been a staunch supporter of technology transfer from our Federal laboratories throughout my career in Congress so that we do see the tremendous benefit, the value, of our technology transfer which we will derive from our research and development space station, and my argument stems from a very basic rationale. The application of federally funded research and development benefits all Americans: the taxpayers who invested in the research and the American economy in terms of the marketplace and the revenues.

My crusade to support technology transfer is certainly no accident. I represent the Third District of Tennessee, which is home to the internationally renowned Oak Ridge National Laboratory. I have seen firsthand the benefits of technology transfer, even through very difficult regulatory situations.

During the 1940's, the 1950's and the 1960's, much of the research and development was conducted by or through the Department of Defense, yet, even though the original project was defense-oriented, our civilian, our peacetime and our commercial applications evolved from these research efforts. We saw breakthroughs in jet propulsion,

antibiotics, synthetic rubber and microwave radar emerge from these studies to create the high-growth industries of the 1960's and 1970's, such as global jet transport, pharmaceuticals, synthetic materials, electronic computers, and many others.

Contributing to the defense contributions, starting about 1960, was the space program. The Federal space program ignited the imagination of all Americans. The space program has contributed achievements making possible today accurate weather satellites, global marine communications, a communication network that unites every continent in the world. The space program has also initiated additional fledgling industries in remote sensing, direct broadcast and navigation that appear likely to become our future growth industries, and with the heightened environmental awareness we see today, we are also fortunate to have the advantages that the space program brought us which enable us to monitor the Earth from afar to note changes in the ozone layer, deforestation, acid rain and myriad other planetary environmental concerns. These advancements stem from a variety of different projects within the space program.

The space station project is the cornerstone of our space program today.

□ 1520

We expended significant efforts, as our chairman and ranking minority member stated, to attract international participation in this major scientific project, only to say to our partners that we have changed our minds. Congress continues to encourage agencies to attract investments and technical partners for our large science projects. If we terminate the space station, we cannot possibly hope to be successful again with our international partners. Once we display our lack of commitment to a project to which we have induced others to contribute, our credibility will be lost to future partnerships.

I also caution this body to bear in mind that the space station is not the only program where this is happening and these same partners are experiencing this lack of foresight in several other program areas.

I do not believe that it is in our Nation's best interests to eliminate programs which hold so much promise for future technological advancement. The redesigned space program will stimulate many fields of science and technology, including those that will be so critical to the economic growth of the Nation in the coming new century.

Let me cite some of these examples again: Artificial intelligence, robotics, process automation, low-cost global and orbital transport, optical communication, ultra-high strength and high-temperature materials, supercomputers, and pollution-free ve-

hicles. These are just a few of the technologies that hold great potential for commercial application. We cannot compete in the world marketplace if we simply turn off the means to new products and technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology which authorizes the space program has given very careful review to this program, and as our authorization bill states, we envision a much different space program than is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] for her remarks. I think she makes some excellent points.

I was listening as the gentlewoman read down through the list of technological advances, and most of what she mentioned has taken place since I graduated from high school in 1960. All of those things she mentioned are things our society now benefits from and are things that did not exist when I was graduating from high school in the year 1960. Yet at that time there was no one who understood that we would be the beneficiaries of those programs.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a spinoff from the research and development that holds such a great potential. But I must again remind my colleague that if we back down on this commitment with our partners, then we can forget looking for any more international cooperation.

Mr. WALKER. Yes. One wonders what the world would be like if the people in 1961 would have listened to the advice of the critics then. I have a point to make here from an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, an editorial that I imagine they wish they could take back, if they could. This is what they said about President Kennedy's plan to go to the moon, and I quote:

So far as we can discover, the only technically competent people who believe it is worth what it is expected to cost are those who have been dreaming of a moon shot for years. Many other scientists whose opinions are entitled to consideration think the stunt, even if it succeeds, is only a stunt and that the Nation will not be rewarded adequately for the enormous outlay * * * There are other and better ways of demonstrating that this is a great nation than by sending an expedition to the moon at staggering costs.

They could not have been more wrong. The fact is that if it had any characteristics at all of a stunt, who cares? The bottom line is that we ended up with enormous benefits out of having made the effort. The benefits are all across our society, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has just given us a list of them, and it makes the person who wrote that editorial

look like an idiot because he obviously had no idea what would be accomplished as a result of making that outreach into space. Again, that person was certainly within the context of his times a competent person who was simply writing based upon the criticism that was then welling up from America. But thank goodness, Congress did not listen to the Chicago Daily Tribune or to critics within this body at that time. They went ahead and did the mission. That is what we have to do in the case of space station, too. We have to muster the courage to go ahead and do the mission, and the Nation will be rewarded enormously for having made the effort.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is certainly correct. These are tough times, and these are tough decisions we have to make this year, but at the same time we have an opportunity on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology to look ahead to the future. There are so many of these programs that we focus in on and authorize that are for development in our future, and we cannot afford to be shortsighted at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time he has given me.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations who did not participate in the dirty deed done on that committee. Nevertheless, he is here on the floor, and we are very grateful to have his participation in this special order. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me, and I commend him for his work in this very important field. I compliment as well my colleague from southern California, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for his leadership and for stressing the role that the United States should play and must play in the field of science.

I must say that I have come to this session late today because I have spent the last couple of hours in the full Committee on Appropriations, where they were considering the bill that came out of the subcommittee where the space station was zeroed.

The full committee did not vote directly on the station today, but discussed the issue rather thoroughly. It was indicated that we will likely have some kind of an amendment on the floor that will allow the debate to continue when the full House meets regarding the up or down vote on this bill.

I think it is very, very important that the public understand that there is broad-based support in both parties for not only a manned space station,

but also for more effort in space research and technology.

Some years ago on the floor we had a vote—almost a prefatory vote—to cut the budget of the Committee on Science and Technology by 15 percent, and Members were in the mood on that particular day to be cutting bills across the board. That had a big impact upon the space station and NASA's efforts. A few weeks after that there was a similar vote on the House floor to cut 15 percent from that program. Once it was debated clearly by Members of the House, we absolutely reversed the reflection of support for space.

There is no doubt that people across the country know that America has a responsibility and must play a role in space. What happens in this subcommittee, though, is very important. Currently the budget lids place great restrictions upon categories of spending. The bill that is coming to us contains the largest amount of discretionary spending on behalf of the appropriations process, some \$60 billion-plus of discretionary spending. Nonetheless, much of that spending goes for popular social programs—veterans' medical care, and housing are examples. In this context some would argue that if you are for the station, you are really against veterans' programs. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The work of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology provides a clear demonstration of bipartisan support for America's commitment to science. Specifically, they have affirmed the role of the United States in this regard; that is, to provide leadership in space research and exploration. The authorizing committee has thus expressed the will of the House.

□ 1530

But, unfortunately, that piece of the committee's important work ended up in an extremely difficult and competitive environment.

So the committee members bringing this subcommittee report to the full committee feel very uncomfortable. What we need to establish is, first, the broad base of bipartisan support this year by way of debate on the floor. From there, we can take this issue from the House to a conference with the Senate, and thereby make sense out of this conflict of priorities.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for this contribution. No one has yet brought this up in connection with our previous hour and one-half or so of debate. I want to make it clear from my own standpoint that I would be very unhappy if any of the debate were to focus on criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee or the members of the Committee on Appropriations for bashing the space pro-

gram. They are not bashers of the space program. They are supporters of the space program. They had a very, very difficult job to do, and they sought to do it in a fashion which they thought on balance would produce the maximum amount of good.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to disagree with that, but I think the gentleman has indicated what the appropriate strategy is here, and that is to try to save the space station and the space program in general, perhaps at reduced levels, and then hope that in the Senate, under slightly different rules and allocations of funding, we can come up with a sufficiently strong improvement that we can proceed with the program which I know we all support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I might add to the point that both the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I are attempting to make here by saying that many of us think certain allocations to the various subcommittees reflect almost a malapportionment of available dollars. A slightly different allocation would have made enough money available, whereby a station could very well have ended up being funded in my subcommittee.

Thus, there is a need for debate on the floor that reflects not only the support of the House for our efforts in space, but also the significant contributions America has to make to science.

Just the other day we had a debate on the floor regarding the superconducting super collider. There, one more time, various elements of the scientific community were concerned about the budgetary competition.

There were those who a few short years ago were actively supporting the superconducting super collider, and now urge that we defend it in order to make money available for another scientific program.

Mr. Speaker, I think one cannot overemphasize this point, and that is that we have several very important experimental, cutting-edge, scientific programs, where America has a commitment, not only to our leadership here at home, but also to our leadership in the world and our partnership commitment to other countries.

The superconducting super collider very much involves that kind of obligation. With the space station, we have commitments to other nations who have their own desires to be involved in space. To walk away from those commitments, and not be willing to make dollar commitments this year that maintain our leadership, would cause much of the rest of the world to choose in the future to question America's commitment in almost any project.

The work that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has accomplished in connection with the manned space station, the role of

NASA, and our future in space is to be commended. Beyond that, it is very important that America know that there is bipartisan support for this effort, an effort that will play a key role in defining American leadership in research, technology, and in space.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for taking this time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] very much. He has made a great contribution here. He has pointed out that part of the problem arose within the budget process when we did not get the kind of priority for space and science that we should have.

I think the gentleman has also helped us understand that this is a matter of making appropriate adjustments in priorities to assure that those priorities that represent an investment in the future are highlighted more than they are in what the Committee on Appropriations has done thus far.

From my own point of view, I do not see how we can possibly take care of the future needs of veterans if we do not have a growing economy. I do not see how we can possibly provide for housing for all of our citizens if we do not have a growing economy. I do not see how we can possibly provide the social welfare that is necessary to help the poorest of the poor if we do not have a growing economy.

Mr. Speaker, what we do understand about the future is the only way to have a growing economy is to make an investment in that future through research and development. One of the places where we are sure if you invest in research and development that you get tremendous returns, is through the space program. There you have to push the very limits of man's knowledge. When you do that, you get all kinds of ancillary benefits no one would have ever imagined.

The fact that we do not exactly create the products as a part of the space program, but we create a theory or a kind of technology that ultimately results in new technologies that have consumer potential, that is what a growing economy is all about. That is the reason why the investment in the future really takes place.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up here, I think our concerns, from our committee and others who have been on the floor, revolve around the fact that if in fact the space station is killed as a part of the appropriations process in the House, it goes way beyond space station. We are really at that point talking about whether or not we will maintain our commitment to the manned space effort that has characterized this Nation's space program for the past 30 years.

I think the American people continue to support that manned space effort. I do not think that they understand that

it is in jeopardy as a result of the action on space station.

Mr. Speaker, let me spend a moment or two and tell you why I think it is in jeopardy because of the action on space station.

The shuttle program has little to do for the future if there is no space station. The word "shuttle," the space shuttle, meant that it was to shuttle between Earth and a space station. That is the reason why it was created.

It was not called a space plane. It was called a shuttle, with a very, very important reason, to go between Earth and a space station. If the space station does not exist, one of the principal purposes for shuttle being created in the first place will cease to exist.

I can imagine the same people who are today critical of space station coming to the floor a year from now or a couple years from now telling us, look, we do not really have a lot in the way of missions for the shuttle. We ought to preserve that asset for the next century when it is really needed. It is time to begin grounding the shuttle flights, time to begin to place that asset on the ground, in hopes that we will retain it for the future. Sometime in the next century, when we have a more robust space program, in fact we can then bring the shuttle back to life and utilize them for those purposes then.

Mr. Speaker, what a tragedy that would be. Then you would not only lose your space station, you would ultimately lose all American manned participation in space. That would put us way behind the technology curve. Certainly at that point, other nations would look toward developing space programs of their own.

The Japanese are not involved in the space station purely out of an interest to participate with the Americans. In fact, the reason why they are there is a result of some negotiations, where the Japanese were going to go ahead and develop their own platforms and their own space program. We convinced them that they would be better off using our launch system and participating with us on the space station. It would get as much out of it, and the international cooperation would create the kind of atmosphere in which everyone would benefit. We talked them into doing this.

If in fact we back out of the space station, the Japanese will not back out of their commitment, long term, to do something on a space program. They will simply begin to go it on their own. The information that they obtain as a result of their own space program may or may not be shared with the United States, and we will end up once more having led the way into something, only to have our allies and our economic adversaries utilize our learning curve to their benefit.

What a tremendous difficulty that would be. We can avoid it by simply moving ahead with the space station.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, SPACE STATION FREEDOM, AND THE QUEST FOR NEW KNOWLEDGE

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his eloquent contribution. I was struck by both his eloquence and his erudition. I look forward to reading to the text of his contribution at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus theorized that if he sailed west across the Atlantic Ocean from Europe, he could find a shorter path to the Orient. His greatest problem was not theoretical, because scientists had demonstrated that the world was round. Neither was his greatest problem technological, because he was a fine navigator, and he trusted the shipbuilders of Portugal to supply him with reliable craft.

The greatest problem that Columbus had was funding. He couldn't find a government that had the vision to support his voyage of discovery across the western horizon. In 1484, Columbus applied to the Portuguese Government for support. He was turned down, his request for funds denied by the Crown. They refused to back a project that demanded a leap into the unknown; they preferred to invest in the exploration of a safer path—to seek the Orient by hugging the coast of Africa, by never venturing far from the sight of land.

Next, Columbus went to England, and was again rebuffed. The English viewed themselves as the outermost bastion of civilization. The idea of sailing west into the savage Atlantic seemed like sheer folly.

As we all know, Columbus found his patrons in Spain, where King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella were convinced that his voyage into the unknown carried the promise of unknown reward. They accommodated the costs of his voyages in their hard-pressed budget, and the history of the world was changed.

Because of this parallel with the voyage of Columbus, space station Freedom was originally selected by NASA and the Congress as our unique commemoration of the beginning of the Age of Exploration and Discovery in 1492. It is indeed ironic that we are this week to debate the question of whether to abdicate our role of leadership in the next great age of exploration—the exploration of the universe beyond Earth.

Now we are faced with a decision of similar proportions. We routinely put human beings in space and bring them home safely, we have walked on the

Moon, we have kept astronauts in orbit for months at a time. Over the past 7 years, in the face of a budget deficit that handicaps our flexibility, we have chosen, year in and year out, to fund the space station Freedom, because it represents the next giant step for mankind in pursuit of new frontiers and new knowledge. We do not know where this step will take us, and that is part of the reason why we must take it.

Now, we have been presented with what looks, on the surface, like a logical choice. Do we continue our manned exploration of space, or do we provide important increases in funding levels for programs that address the everyday needs of many of our citizens. In fact, this choice is illogical—irrational—in the extreme. It is like giving a farmer the choice of having enough drinking water for his immediate needs, or enough irrigation water for next year's crop. The choice is unacceptable. We must satisfy basic human needs today and we must also strive to advance the frontiers of knowledge as we move into the 21st century.

In his conclusion to his great work, "The Ascent of Man", Jacob Bronowski said: "We are a scientific civilization: that means, a civilization in which knowledge and its integrity are crucial. Science is only a Latin word for knowledge." And how do we best pursue knowledge? Albert Einstein said it best, and with the greatest simplicity: "All knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it." The manned space program is the embodiment of the search for knowledge through experience. And knowledge is the true seed from which our Nation grows.

This afternoon, we will discuss both the importance of science and technology to the prosperity of our society, and the importance of our space program in general—and the space station Freedom in specific—to our system of science and technology. The arguments are clear, rooted in economics, and engineering, and history. But ultimately, the decision that we make about the future of space station Freedom will reflect our own vision of ourselves: do we want to continue our quest for knowledge—for experience—or do we want, like the King of Portugal in the days of Columbus, to hug the shore, take the safe route, and sacrifice both the promise and the dangers of the distant and unseen horizon.

□ 1540

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Associate Administrator for Space Flight, Mr. William B. Lenoir, to me as of this date, bearing upon the subject.

The letter referred to follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1991.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BROWN: If effected, the recent recommendation by the House Appropriations Committee to terminate the Space Station Freedom would put the United States on a downhill slide out of manned space operations. Our manned spaceflight strategy for the next two decades revolves around the Space Station. Without a Space Station, our program is unbalanced and visionless. I would like to describe how the Space Station is woven into the U.S. manned space program and is, in fact, the equivalent of the manned space program.

The goals and objectives of our spaceflight program for the coming decade are:

Support Customer Space Transportation Requirements.

Develop Permanently Manned Space Station Capability.

Maintain and Enhance Shuttle Capabilities.

Increase Efficiency of Major Operational Space Flight Programs.

Develop New Heavy Lift Launch Capabilities.

Develop and Maintain World Class Resources.

How does Space Station Freedom support the achievement of these goals and objectives?

SUPPORT CUSTOMER SPACE TRANSPORTATION
REQUIREMENTS

In the late 1990's the Space Station becomes the primary "customer" for the Space Shuttle, requiring about 70% of Shuttle capability. Without that demand, the Space Shuttle, the only remaining element of the manned space program, will wither and atrophy, taking with it U.S. preeminence in manned space flight.

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE CAPABILITIES

Most of the planned Shuttle enhancements are being made specifically to provide increased capability and opportunity for the Space Station. Improvements such as the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor, Extended Duration Orbiter, and various subsystem upgrades become questionable if their driving element is removed.

INCREASE EFFICIENCY OF MAJOR OPERATIONAL
SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAMS

Our two major operational spaceflight programs are the Space Shuttle and the Space Station. Plans to effect operational efficiencies are built on the synergism between the two. Removing one causes a loss of focus within the other, resulting in less efficient operations.

DEVELOP NEW HEAVY LIFT LAUNCH
CAPABILITIES

The primary NASA requirement for a new heavy lift launch vehicle is for increased capability to support Space Station Freedom. Space Exploration is too far downstream to be an effective focus for a new launch vehicle in the near term. However, Freedom can benefit significantly from such a new vehicle. Following initiation of permanent manning of the Station, larger, less expensive expansions can be planned—more power, more living space, more laboratory space, new capabilities. Logistics resupply could be performed more efficiently with a new, larger vehicle. Whereas a Space Station makes sense before a New Launch System is built, it is not at all obvious that the converse is true.

DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN WORLD CLASS
RESOURCES

This primarily means our work force—our highly skilled civil service work force and our contractor teams. Without the draw of a near-term, challenging new program like the Space Station, we will simply not be competitive for the highest caliber, cream-of-the-crop talent that has enabled us to pioneer the United States to the forefront in space. NASA will no longer be the NASA we know today. We must have the exciting attraction of a near-term, challenging, horizon-expanding program if we are to continue to attract our youth to careers in science and technology, and draw a subset of these youth to NASA, thereby maintaining the quality of the work force propelling us onward.

As you can see, the spaceflight programs that would survive a Space Station termination would be terribly unbalanced. The need and desirability of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor would require reexamination, as would the beginning steps of the New Launch System. Initial space-based investigations for future space exploration would not be appropriate, and our entire Advanced Programs thrust would be wrong. In short, the focus and implementation of the remaining aspects of our manned space program would require significant reassessment and revision.

The manned spaceflight program remaining without Space Station Freedom would be reminiscent of the post-Apollo era, when the United States essentially took a decade off. NASA's spaceflight effort shrank and, with it, almost ¾ of a million jobs were lost in the U.S. economy over the decade following the peak of the Apollo program. It has been a long, slow climb back, but we have rearrived as a nation. We cannot allow ourselves to abdicate, once again, world leadership in manned spaceflight operations and technology.

Make no mistake—the issue as framed by the House Appropriations Committee is not the mere reordering of space priorities. We are talking neither about a shift of emphases within the space program, nor about a shift from one technological investment to another. We are talking about abandoning the field. We are talking about a major step backward. And we are talking about the beginning of the end of the U.S. manned space program.

We need your help and support to avoid this national tragedy.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. LENOIR,
Associate Administrator
for Space Flight.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO
DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may be authorized to declare a recess until 4:15 p.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House will be in recess

until approximately 4:15 p.m. Bells will be rung 15 minutes prior to reconvening.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:14 p.m.

□ 1610

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 2508, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, 1992 AND 1993, AND H.R. 2474, ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H.R. 2508, authorizing foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 and on H.R. 2474, the Arms Control and Disarmaments Amendments Act of 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 1642, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 2042, by the yeas and nays; and S. 483, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

PALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 8, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—323

Abercrombie	Ford (MI)	Mineta
Allard	Frank (MA)	Mink
Anderson	Franks (CT)	Moakley
Andrews (ME)	Gallo	Molinar
Andrews (NJ)	Gaydos	Mollohan
Annunzio	Gekas	Montgomery
Anthony	Geren	Moorhead
Applegate	Gibbons	Moran
Archer	Gilchrest	Morella
Atkins	Gillmor	Morrison
AuCoin	Gilman	Murphy
Bacchus	Glickman	Murtha
Barnard	Gonzalez	Myers
Barrett	Goss	Nagle
Barton	Grandy	Natcher
Bateman	Guarini	Neal (NC)
Bellenson	Gunderson	Nichols
Bennett	Hall (OH)	Nowak
Bentley	Hall (TX)	Oakar
Bereuter	Hamilton	Oberstar
Berman	Hammerschmidt	Obey
Bevill	Hansen	Olin
Bilbray	Harris	Ortiz
Bilirakis	Hastert	Owens (UT)
Bliley	Hayes (IL)	Packard
Bonior	Hayes (LA)	Pallone
Borski	Hefner	Parker
Boucher	Henry	Paxon
Brewster	Herger	Payne (NJ)
Brooks	Hertel	Payne (VA)
Broomfield	Hoagland	Pease
Browder	Hobson	Pelosi
Brown	Hopkins	Penny
Bruce	Horn	Perkins
Bryant	Horton	Peterson (FL)
Bunning	Houghton	Peterson (MN)
Bustamante	Hoyer	Petri
Byron	Hubbard	Pickett
Cardin	Huckaby	Porter
Carper	Hughes	Pursell
Carr	Hunter	Rahall
Chandler	Hyde	Ramstad
Chapman	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Clement	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Clinger	Johnson (TX)	Regula
Coleman (MO)	Jones (NC)	Rhodes
Coleman (TX)	Jontz	Richardson
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Ridge
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Riggs
Combest	Kasich	Rinaldo
Condit	Kennelly	Ritter
Conyers	Kildee	Roberts
Cooper	Klecza	Roe
Costello	Klug	Roemer
Coughlin	Kolbe	Rogers
Cox (CA)	Kolter	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox (IL)	Kopetski	Rose
Coyne	Kostmayer	Rostenkowski
Cramer	Kyl	Roth
Cunningham	Lagomarsino	Roukema
Darden	Lantos	Rowland
Davis	LaRocco	Roybal
de la Garza	Laughlin	Russo
DeFazio	Leach	Sabo
DeLauro	Lent	Sarpaluis
DeLay	Levin (MI)	Sawyer
Dellums	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Derrick	Lewis (GA)	Schaefer
Dingell	Lightfoot	Schiff
Dixon	Lloyd	Schroeder
Donnelly	Long	Schulze
Dooley	Lowery (CA)	Schumer
Doolittle	Machtley	Sharp
Dornan (CA)	Manton	Shaw
Dreier	Markay	Shays
Durbin	Martinez	Shuster
Dwyer	Matsui	Sisisky
Dymally	Mavroules	Skaggs
Early	Mazzoli	Skeen
Eckart	McCloskey	Skelton
Edwards (CA)	McCollum	Slattery
Edwards (OK)	McCurdy	Slaughter (NY)
Edwards (TX)	McDade	Slaughter (VA)
Emerson	McEwen	Smith (FL)
Engel	McGrath	Smith (IA)
English	McMillen (MD)	Smith (NJ)
Erdreich	McNulty	Smith (OR)
Evans	Meyers	Smith (TX)
Fascell	Mfume	Solarz
Fawell	Michel	Solomon
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Spence
Fish	Miller (OH)	Staggers
Flake	Miller (WA)	Stallings

Stark	Torricelli	Weldon
Stearns	Trafiacant	Wheat
Stokes	Traxler	Whitten
Studds	Unsoeld	Wilson
Sundquist	Upton	Wolf
Swift	Valentine	Wolpe
Synar	Vander Jagt	Wyden
Tallon	Vento	Wyllie
Tanner	Visclosky	Yates
Tauzin	Vucanovich	Yatron
Taylor (MS)	Walker	Young (AK)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (FL)
Thomas (CA)	Waters	Zeliff
Thomas (GA)	Weber	Zimmer
Thomas (WY)	Weiss	

NAYS—8

Coble	Duncan	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Hancock	Stump
Dannemeyer	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman	Green	Neal (MA)
Alexander	Hatcher	Nussle
Andrews (TX)	Hefley	Orton
Armey	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Aspin	Holloway	Oxley
Baker	Hutto	Panetta
Ballenger	Inhofe	Patterson
Boehert	Ireland	Pickle
Boehner	Jacobs	Poshard
Boxer	James	Price
Burton	Jefferson	Quillen
Callahan	Jenkins	Ravenel
Camp	Johnston	Ray
Campbell (CA)	Jones (GA)	Sanders
Campbell (CO)	Kennedy	Sangmeister
Clay	LaFalce	Santorum
Dickinson	Lancaster	Scheuer
Dicks	Lehman (CA)	Serrano
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Sikorski
Downey	Levine (CA)	Snowe
Espy	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Feighan	Lipinski	Stenholm
Fields	Livingston	Swett
Foglietta	Lowey (NY)	Thornton
Ford (TN)	Luken	Torres
Frost	Marlenee	Towns
Gallegly	Martin	Volkmer
Gejdenson	McCandless	Washington
Gephardt	McCrery	Waxman
Gingrich	McDermott	Williams
Goodling	McHugh	Wise
Gordon	McMillan (NC)	
Gradison	Moody	
Gray	Mrazek	

□ 1643

Messrs. DANNEMEYER, STUMP, COBLE, HANCOCK, DUNCAN, and SENSENBRENNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND
CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2042.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Boucher] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2042, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair reminds Members this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 5, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—326

Abercrombie	Dingell	Jones (NC)
Allard	Dixon	Jontz
Anderson	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Andrews (ME)	Dooley	Kaptur
Andrews (NJ)	Doolittle	Kasich
Annunzio	Dorman (CA)	Kennelly
Anthony	Dreier	Kildee
Applegate	Durbin	Klecza
Archer	Dymally	Klug
Atkins	Early	Kolbe
AuCoin	Eckart	Kolter
Bacchus	Edwards (CA)	Kopetski
Barnard	Edwards (OK)	Kostmayer
Barrett	Edwards (TX)	Kyl
Barton	Emerson	Lagomarsino
Bateman	Engel	Lantos
Beilenson	English	LaRocco
Bennett	Erdreich	Laughlin
Bentley	Evans	Leach
Bereuter	Fascell	Lent
Berman	Fawell	Levin (MI)
Bevill	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Bilbray	Fish	Lewis (GA)
Billakis	Flake	Lightfoot
Bliley	Ford (MI)	Lloyd
Bonior	Frank (MA)	Long
Borski	Franks (CT)	Lowery (CA)
Boucher	Gallo	Machtley
Brewster	Gaydos	Manton
Brooks	Gekas	Markey
Broomfield	Geren	Martinez
Browder	Gibbons	Matsui
Brown	Gilchrest	Mavroules
Bruce	Gillmor	Mazzoli
Bryant	Gilman	McCloskey
Bunning	Glickman	McCollum
Bustamante	Gonzalez	McCurdy
Byron	Goss	McDade
Cardin	Grandy	McEwen
Carper	Guarini	McGrath
Carr	Gunderson	McMillen (MD)
Chandler	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Chapman	Hall (TX)	Meyers
Clement	Hamilton	Mfume
Clinger	Hammerschmidt	Michel
Coble	Hansen	Miller (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Harris	Miller (OH)
Coleman (TX)	Hastert	Miller (WA)
Collins (IL)	Hayes (IL)	Mineta
Collins (MI)	Hayes (LA)	Mink
Combest	Hefner	Moakley
Condit	Henry	Molinari
Conyers	Herger	Mollohan
Cooper	Hertel	Montgomery
Costello	Hoagland	Moorhead
Coughlin	Hobson	Moran
Cox (CA)	Hopkins	Morella
Cox (IL)	Horn	Morrison
Coyne	Horton	Murphy
Cramer	Houghton	Murtha
Cunningham	Hoyer	Myers
Darden	Hubbard	Nagle
Davis	Huckaby	Natcher
de la Garza	Hughes	Neal (NC)
DeFazio	Hunter	Nichols
DeLauro	Hyde	Nowak
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Oakar
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Oberstar
Derrick	Johnson (TX)	Obey

Olin	Rowland
Ortiz	Roybal
Owens (UT)	Russo
Packard	Sabo
Pallone	Sarpaluis
Parker	Sawyer
Paxon	Saxton
Payne (NJ)	Schaefer
Payne (VA)	Schiff
Pease	Schroeder
Pelosi	Schulze
Penny	Schumer
Perkins	Sensenbrenner
Peterson (FL)	Sharp
Peterson (MN)	Shaw
Petri	Shays
Pickett	Shuster
Porter	Sikorski
Pursell	Sisisky
Rahall	Skaggs
Ramstad	Skeen
Rangel	Skelton
Reed	Slattery
Regula	Slaughter (NY)
Rhodes	Slaughter (VA)
Richardson	Smith (FL)
Ridge	Smith (IA)
Riggs	Smith (NJ)
Rinaldo	Smith (OR)
Ritter	Smith (TX)
Roberts	Solarz
Roe	Solomon
Roemer	Spence
Rogers	Staggers
Rohrabacher	Stallings
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark
Rose	Stearns
Rostenkowski	Stokes
Roth	Studds
Roukema	Sundquist

NAYS—5

Crane	Duncan	Stump
Dannemeyer	Hancock	

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman	Gray	Mrazek
Alexander	Green	Neal (MA)
Andrews (TX)	Hatcher	Nussle
Armey	Hefley	Orton
Aspin	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Baker	Holloway	Oxley
Ballenger	Hutto	Panetta
Boehlert	Inhofe	Patterson
Boehner	Ireland	Pickle
Boxer	Jacobs	Poshard
Burton	James	Price
Callahan	Jefferson	Quillen
Camp	Jenkins	Ravenel
Campbell (CA)	Johnston	Ray
Campbell (CO)	Jones (GA)	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy	Sangmeister
Dickinson	LaFalce	Santorum
Dicks	Lancaster	Savage
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (CA)	Scheuer
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Serrano
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Snowe
Espy	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Feighan	Lipinski	Stenholm
Fields	Livingston	Swett
Foglietta	Lowey (NY)	Thornton
Ford (TN)	Luken	Torres
Frost	Marlenee	Towns
Gallely	Martin	Volkmer
Gephardson	McCandless	Washington
Gingrich	McCrery	Waxman
Goodling	McDermott	Williams
Gordon	McHugh	Wise
Gradison	McMillan (NC)	
	Moody	

□ 1651

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TACONIC MOUNTAINS PROTECTION
ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 483.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 483, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 15, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—316

Abercrombie	Dooley	Kennelly
Allard	Dreier	Kildee
Anderson	Duncan	Klecza
Andrews (ME)	Durbin	Klug
Andrews (NJ)	Dymally	Kolbe
Annunzio	Early	Kolter
Anthony	Eckart	Kopetski
Applegate	Edwards (CA)	Kostmayer
Archer	Edwards (OK)	Kyl
Atkins	Edwards (TX)	Lagomarsino
AuCoin	Emerson	Lantos
Bacchus	Engel	LaRocco
Barnard	English	Laughlin
Barrett	Erdreich	Leach
Bateman	Evans	Lent
Beilenson	Fascell	Levin (MI)
Bennett	Fawell	Lewis (CA)
Bentley	Fazio	Lewis (GA)
Bereuter	Fish	Lightfoot
Berman	Flake	Lloyd
Bevill	Ford (MI)	Long
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Lowery (CA)
Billakis	Franks (CT)	Machtley
Bliley	Gallo	Manton
Bonior	Gaydos	Markey
Borski	Gekas	Martinez
Boucher	Geren	Matsui
Brewster	Gibbons	Mavroules
Brooks	Gilchrest	Mazzoli
Broomfield	Gillmor	McCloskey
Browder	Gilman	McCollum
Brown	Glickman	McCurdy
Bruce	Gonzalez	McDade
Bryant	Goss	McEwen
Bunning	Grandy	McGrath
Bustamante	Guarini	McMillen (MD)
Byron	Gunderson	McNulty
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Meyers
Carper	Hall (TX)	Mfume
Carr	Hamilton	Michel
Chandler	Hansen	Miller (CA)
Chapman	Harris	Miller (OH)
Clement	Hastert	Miller (WA)
Clinger	Hayes (IL)	Mineta
Coleman (MO)	Hayes (LA)	Mink
Coleman (TX)	Hefner	Moakley
Collins (IL)	Henry	Molinari
Collins (MI)	Herger	Mollohan
Combest	Hertel	Montgomery
Condit	Hoagland	Moorhead
Conyers	Hobson	Moran
Cooper	Hopkins	Morella
Costello	Horn	Morrison
Coughlin	Horton	Murphy
Cox (CA)	Houghton	Murtha
Cox (IL)	Hoyer	Myers
Coyne	Hubbard	Nagle
Cramer	Huckaby	Natcher
Cunningham	Hughes	Neal (NC)
Darden	Hunter	Nichols
Davis	Hyde	Nowak
de la Garza	Johnson (CT)	Oakar
DeFazio	Johnson (SD)	Oberstar
DeLauro	Johnson (TX)	Obey
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Olin
Dellums	Jontz	Ortiz
Derrick	Kanjorski	Owens (UT)
	Kaptur	Packard
	Kasich	Pallone

Parker	Sabo	Tallon
Paxon	Sarpallus	Tanner
Payne (NJ)	Sawyer	Tauzin
Payne (VA)	Saxton	Taylor (MS)
Pease	Schaefer	Thomas (CA)
Pelosi	Schiff	Thomas (GA)
Penny	Schroeder	Thomas (WY)
Perkins	Schulze	Torricelli
Peterson (FL)	Schumer	Traficant
Peterson (MN)	Sharp	Traxler
Petri	Shaw	Unsoeld
Pickett	Shays	Upton
Porter	Shuster	Valentine
Pursell	Sikorski	Vander Jagt
Rahall	Sisisky	Vento
Ramstad	Skaggs	Visclosky
Rangel	Skeen	Vucanovich
Reed	Skelton	Walsh
Regula	Slaterry	Waters
Rhodes	Slaughter (NY)	Weber
Richardson	Slaughter (VA)	Weiss
Ridge	Smith (FL)	Weldon
Riggs	Smith (IA)	Whitten
Rinaldo	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Ritter	Smith (OR)	Wolf
Roberts	Smith (TX)	Wolpe
Roe	Solarz	Wyden
Roemer	Solomon	Wyllie
Rogers	Spence	Yates
Ros-Lehtinen	Staggers	Yatron
Rose	Stallings	Young (AK)
Rostenkowski	Stark	Young (FL)
Roth	Stokes	Zeliff
Roukema	Studds	Zimmer
Rowland	Sundquist	
Roybal	Swift	
Russo	Synar	

NAYS—15

Barton	Doolittle	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Dornan (CA)	Stearns
Crane	Hammerschmidt	Stump
Dannemeyer	Hancock	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Rohrabacher	Walker

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman	Gray	Mrazek
Alexander	Green	Neal (MA)
Andrews (TX)	Hatcher	Nussle
Army	Hefley	Orton
Aspin	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Baker	Holloway	Oxley
Ballenger	Hutto	Panetta
Boehlert	Inhofe	Patterson
Boehner	Ireland	Pickle
Boxer	Jacobs	Poshard
Burton	James	Price
Callahan	Jefferson	Quillen
Camp	Jenkins	Ravenel
Campbell (CA)	Johnston	Ray
Campbell (CO)	Jones (GA)	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy	Sangmeister
Dickinson	LaFalce	Santorum
Dicks	Lancaster	Savage
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (CA)	Scheuer
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Serrano
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Snowe
Espy	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Feighan	Lipinski	Stenholm
Fields	Livingston	Swett
Foglietta	Lowe (NY)	Thornton
Ford (TN)	Luken	Torres
Frost	Marlenee	Towns
Gallely	Martin	Volkmer
Gejdenson	McCandless	Washington
Gephardt	McCrery	Waxman
Gingrich	McDermott	Williams
Goodling	McHugh	Wise
Gordon	McMillan (NC)	
Gradison	Moody	

□ 1701

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, during the following rollcall votes today, June 3, 1991, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district in Connecticut. I would submit this statement to be included in the RECORD after the votes.

On rollcall No. 122, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

On rollcall No. 123, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

On rollcall No. 124, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official commitments in my 12th Congressional District, I was unable to record my position on rollcall votes 122, 123, and 124. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 122: "Yea" H.R. 1642, Palo Alto Battlefield Historic Site; rollcall No. 123: "Yea" H.R. 2042, Federal Fire Prevention and Control; and rollcall No. 124: "Yea" S. 483, Taconic Mountains Protection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was attending meetings with North Carolina officials. Unfortunately, I missed rollcall votes 122, 123, and 124. I support each measure and would like to be recorded as voting "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I held the first meeting of my Veterans' Advisory Board back in my Pittsburgh congressional district and was not present to cast my vote on the three bills considered under suspension of which the yeas and nays were requested. Had I been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "aye" on Rollcall 122, Rollcall 123, and Rollcall 124 and ask unanimous consent that this explanation appear in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable scheduling commitments in my district, I was unable to participate in the three recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 1642, the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991; H.R. 2042, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act authorization; and S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, because I was in the 10th district today holding town hall meetings, I was unable to return to Washington in time for the rollcall votes. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I

would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1642—the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991, H.R. 2042—the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act Authorization, and S. 483—the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991. I should also add that my vote would not have changed the outcome of this legislation.

EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY ON PORTIONS OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

(For messages, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, June 3, 1991.)

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, SUNDRY INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AND OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

Mr. COUGHLIN reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when we return to the special orders, I be allowed to reclaim my 5 minutes under the special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order be considered right after the 5-minute special order of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

"THANK YOU" BY BOBBY NICHOLAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a song written by one of my constituents, Mr. Bobby Nicholas, of Morgantown, WV. The song is titled "Thank You," and it is written in honor of our troops who served during the crisis in the gulf and as a way for one American to speak for many Americans in saying "Thank you for a job well done."

Because I believe that this is a good song that speaks to our values, I have requested that Mr. Nicholas be allowed to perform the song during our "Welcome Home the Troops" celebration on June 8. For anyone at the administration who may be listening, I will add that I have not yet received a response to my request.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues will enjoy this song, especially when they consider that Mr. Nicholas' son had just entered the Army Reserves when the crisis in the gulf erupted. All of us who are parents, especially those whose children served, will appreciate the depth of emotion that this song elicits.

If Members do enjoy this song as much as I believe they will, Mr. Speaker, they may feel free to call the administration and tell them that they would like to hear Mr. Nicholas perform it, too.

Mr. Nicholas wrote the song at 5 o'clock in the morning. He could not sleep. The inspiration hit him and he wrote the song.

Mr. Speaker, there have already been several fitting tributes paid to those who served in the Persian Gulf. In West Virginia, communities large and small have sponsored parades and welcome-home celebrations. Yesterday I joined with residents of my own home town of Keyser in a welcome-home celebration. The victory parades and welcome-home ceremonies are fitting tributes for those who served. However, the true measure of the Nation's gratitude will be found in our VA hospitals and vet centers. It will be reflected in the quality of services and benefits we provide veterans and their families.

This Saturday, as we celebrate the victory, I hope that those Americans who are still serving in the Persian Gulf will not be forgotten. The West Virginians, including members of the 351st Ordnance Company out of Romney, continue to serve and their families and friends anxiously await their

return. I have met with Pentagon officials and they have assured me that members of the 351st will be home by August. They are preparing a shipment for some billion dollars' worth of ammunition and materials back to the United States. The 351st will miss the parade Saturday but I am sure there will be a fitting welcome.

There were some old lessons reaffirmed with the war in the Persian Gulf. Though the victory was swift and decisive in the Persian Gulf, we know that no war is fought without the loss of human lives. Loss of lives in the Persian Gulf includes Joseph Kime III of Charlestown, WV; Joseph Bongiomini III of Morgantown, WV; and Ruben G. Kirk III of Dunlow, WV.

We know that no war is fought without sacrifice and that sacrifice includes the families and friends of those who serve in the Armed Forces. No war is fought without cost and that cost must include what has been termed the "continuing cost of war," the cost of fulfilling the promises made to those who served in the Armed Forces. Those promises include health care, educational benefits and home loans.

Parades and homecoming celebrations are fitting tributes to those who served in the Persian Gulf, but the lasting tribute will be what we do here in the Congress to honor those who served to defend America and the freedoms and liberties we cherish.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nicholas' song "Thank You" is as follows:

THANK YOU

(By Bobby Nicholas)

It's such an inspiration, to see a Nation sing America the Beautiful, just let our freedom ring

To see little girls and little boys waving the flag instead of toys
To see moms and dads joining hands in celebration of common man.

Chorus:

We just want to say thank you for all that you have done
You made us proud to be an American
We as people stand as one
and we must all remember so we don't forget the price we pay for freedom isn't over yet.

We just want to say thank you for now you let us see that we can live together, in peace and harmony

From Fort Bragg to Chicago
From sea to shining sea
We did it all together, my brother, you and me.

We just want to say thank you for the sacrifice you made
We know it wasn't easy
far away from home each day
From Spokane down to Galveston
From Boston to L.A.
You pulled it all together to brighten up this day.

I can only wonder, what old Abe would say today

to see the north and south, fighting together
From Gettysburg to Atlanta, GA.
To see men and women, black and white standing side by side for freedom's right

Oh, if he were here today, I'm sure this is what he'd say.

To be spoken: That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government, of the people by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

We just want to say thank you for we can hold our heads up high
Yes you have brought us all together under one big sky

We thank you Norm and Colin
You showed our Nation's pride
That we will all remember, until the day we die

So let us sing . . . God Bless America.

The song Thank You was originally to be an open letter to the men and women who served in the Persian Gulf. I thought that it would be a wonderful way to say thank you for a job well done. At the time my son had just entered the Army Reserves, and then I knew what every mother or father, brother or sister, husband or wife in any conflict, from Korea to the Persian Gulf must have felt. The sense of helplessness and worry, of just wanting to do something and not being able to, praying that they would all return home safely. There is a phrase in the song that says that we must all remember so we don't forget that the price we pay for freedom isn't over yet. Those words never were more true than now. Looking at my eight-year-old I could only wonder if some day he also would be called to serve his country. We can only hope that this will be the last time that we have to fight for what we know is right. I guess there is a lesson to be learned in all of this. That is when the time came to stand together as a nation, we did it, without reservation. Side by side, north and south, black and white. So lets all keep the spirit of unity alive to make this nation what we all know it can be. A place where all people can live in Peace and Harmony. I will take the liberty of speaking for all the people of this great country in giving you a well deserved THANK YOU.

Sincerely yours,

We the People of the U.S.A.

CELEBRATION OF ITALIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Italian-Americans and Italians around the world who celebrated the 45th anniversary of Italian Constitution Day on June 2. This joyous occasion is the principal national holiday in Italy, and it commemorates the referendum of June 2, 1946, which abolished the monarch and made Italy a democratic republic under President Luigi Einaudi.

The formation of the Italian Republic is testament to the resiliency, spirit, and patriotism of the Italian people, who emerged from World War II intent upon creating a democratic nation with universal adult suffrage. Italy's search for democracy is embodied in its national anthem, "Inno di mameli"—Hymn of Mameli—which was written by the Italian patriot Goffredo Mameli and adopted on June 2, 1946. Italy's devotion to constitutional democracy is also reflected in its national flag. The green, white, and red of the Italian flag are

symbolic of independence, democracy, and unity, respectively.

Like our own constitution the Italian Constitution reflects the moral fabric of the Italian people. The Constitution expresses love of liberty, respect for human rights, religion, open expression and equality for all. It has withstood economic hard times, the superpower friction of the cold war, and internal political instability.

Following passage of a referendum on June 2, 1946, the Republic of Italy was established by a margin of 2 million votes. As a result, the monarchy was abolished, and King Umberto II was forced into exile. With the republic official, the newly elected constituent assembly was entrusted with the duty of creating a new constitution. The constituent assembly succeeded in establishing the modern Italian Constitution, which went into force in January 1948, and which has stood the test of time as a symbol of the triumph of democracy over totalitarianism, and despotism.

Today, Italy stands free, united, and proud of its 45 years of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating this landmark in the evolution of democracy not only in Italy, but around the world.

□ 1710

SUPPORT SPACE STATION FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to talk about the space station today.

I am a member of the Science and Space Committee, and I really thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for organizing today's special orders and providing the leadership and support for space station Freedom.

I rise in support of the space station. I do not have a significant space interest economically in my district out in Oregon, and so I speak as one who cannot be accused of being tainted, if you will, or having an economic interest at heart that directly affects the employment base of my district. In fact, if anything, one could argue that I should be supporting the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee's action, and because of the needs of so many people in this country, that perhaps we should not fund the space station but, rather, I am not taking that course this week in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this action because I believe that the space station is the right action for this Congress and this Nation to take. The history of our great Nation is the history of reaching to new frontiers.

For the past 30 years, space has been the new frontier for our country. Space has captivated and united our country and even the world. It is both the peaceful means of bringing people to-

gether and a catalyst for new ideas and the sharing of technologies with our friendly partners.

Certainly we all realize the budget dilemma that confronts this Nation and the limited dollars that we do have that was a crucial aspect to the decision by the appropriations subcommittee to terminate space station funding.

The space station is expensive. There is no doubt about it. But I believe strongly that we must push on.

Congress has cut back on space station funding in recent years, and the Congress should continue to monitor the project closely to ensure that our limited funds are spent appropriately.

President Kennedy, in a joint address to the Congress on May 25, 1961, talked about a lunar mission and the United States role in space, and he stated,

First, I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth. I believe we should go to the Moon, but there is no sense in agreeing or desiring that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens to make it successful.

Who can forget the incredible first picture of Neil Armstrong taking America's first steps on the Moon? All of America was overcome with pride as Armstrong said, "That's one step for man, one giant leap for mankind." We will never forget those who have perished in the pursuit of the stars, most recently in 1987 when the shuttle *Challenger* exploded. These are but two examples of the work and the burdens we have shouldered in exploring space.

I submit that we have a responsibility to continue to do this work, to continue to shoulder the burdens of space exploration. I also believe that the American people support our leadership role in space and the space station.

Clearly we may not be able to fund it at the level that would move us to our end on the perfect timetable. We may have to cut back a little bit. We may have to accommodate the fact that we do have pressing domestic needs here at home in America.

But today space station Freedom is an example also of international cooperation, an example that sets the stage for future cooperation among nations.

If we cancel the space station, it will be an example of the United States failing to meet its commitments to other nations, and this will affect future cooperative ventures as well. These ventures may be in science with projects like the superconducting super collider, or they may be in agriculture or manufacturing, as well. The United States invited Canada, invited Japan; we invited them to participate in the space station Freedom program. Any changes in the program must be done with the knowledge that the United

States is no longer the sole interested party here.

President Kennedy later in 1962 stated, "Many years ago the great British explorer George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it. He said, 'Because it is there.' Well, space is there, and we are going to climb it, and the Moon and the planets are there," and new hopes for knowledge come, and peace, and peace and cooperation, I believe, come with this.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must pursue these new hopes for knowledge. Who knows what discoveries await space station Freedom?

We cannot afford not to build the space station; to give up now is to disappoint all of those who have gone before, and to give up now ends America's quest for new frontiers.

I am not willing to say no to that great American tradition.

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRADE NEGOTIATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week this House had a very important debate concerning the United States-Mexico trade negotiations and on a vote of 192 to 231, this House gave the Bush administration the authority to proceed on these historic negotiations.

These particular negotiations are especially important to districts like mine which have heavy manufacturing bases. Our State of Ohio has already lost over 120,000 jobs to Mexico. When the border is completely opened, it is no secret that we will lose thousands and thousands more.

Today I would like to read a letter that I just received. I think it is important to put on the record what is really at stake and important in these negotiations, and I hope that President Bush and his staff listen to this letter, because I know I will receive others like it.

DEAR MARCY: I work at Dura Mechanical Components Inc. in Toledo, Ohio. We have been working without a contract since February 1, 1991. We did not strike because the company would probably move out or replace us. Recently, on May 10, 1991, we had a meeting set-up with the company lawyers thinking they were going to negotiate a contract with us. When the lawyers came into the meeting all they said was that they had bad news. The company had made a decision to close Dura.

I see the stress that is affecting all the people. It is hard to understand how a company is allowed under the laws to do this to employees. But the plant that they have in Mexico will receive half of our work; its Tennessee plant will receive the rest.

Sunday morning, May 12, 1991, one of the tool room employees took a hunting rifle and shot himself in the head dying instantly.

The laws in this country should help protect us. The free trade agreement with Mexico will only cause more jobs to be moved. At Dura we make an average of \$10.65 per hour plus fringes. The Dura Mexican plant only pays around 60 cents per hour plus fringes. How can we compete with them? Our government was formed to protect and help the people not work against us.

One of the problems we face when we are laid-off is the high cost of insurance. My wife has had three back operations and carpal tunnel. She's not able to get a job with insurance. It is hard to pay her doctor bills. How are we expected to pay with no insurance? We need national health insurance so that we don't have this to worry about.

I have worked at Dura for 47 years. My pension here would be \$581.25. Most people here will receive less than half this amount. When I lose my job, insurance cost will amount to \$310.00 per month. Take that from the pension I would receive and it comes to \$271.25 a month for 47 years work at Dura. Most employees after paying their insurance would have nothing left. But it is better than moving to Mexico. I am 63 years old.

Sincerely,

□ 1720

Mr. President, I would hope that when your trade negotiators sit down at the table with the negotiators from Mexico, they will be thinking about people like this gentleman and hundreds of others like him in my district who have now lost their jobs to Mexican companies. What is at stake here is their lives, our community, and our standard of living.

CHALLENGING BASE CLOSURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge the Department of Defense's recommendations for closures and realignments, in particular, to critique the Department of the Navy recommendation to realign White Oak Laboratory, Silver Spring, MD, which is in my congressional district. As you know, I testified before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission on May 22, 1991. I have felt strongly throughout the process that the proposal impacting on the defense laboratories needs to be weighed carefully and in concert with congressional intent. Today, I want to enlist the support of my colleagues in challenging this proposal as there is still time to influence the process.

The Honorable Jim Courter, a former colleague of ours, chairs the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. He has said that he will not rubber stamp the DOD proposed list. In fact, on Friday, May 31, 1991, the Courter Commission added 27 bases to the list for consideration, giving a strong sign that he is listening to alternative recommendations. In addition, during the

May 21-22, 1991 hearing at which I testified, and again at the Philadelphia regional hearing on May 24, 1991, Mr. Courter, along with other members of the Commission, indicated that they would be making a decision soon about whether or not it would consider defense laboratories as part of its overall recommendations. We expect public deliberation on that decision Thursday, June 6, 1991.

In addition to wanting to reach a wider audience with my commentary, I also want to emphasize a key point regarding the Defense Department's move to include Department of Defense laboratories on the April 15, 1991 list with the hope that I can enlist support in my challenge to the laboratory recommendations. As you may already know, the list includes proposals to close or realign many research and development laboratories across the services. The Navy, in using this vehicle, proposes to alter 90 percent of the framework of its current laboratory structure. Unfortunately, the Navy plan has been hastily conceived, ill-documented, and haphazardly analyzed for cost—the GAO has confirmed this assessment of their approach. The plan contains many inconsistencies and threatens to erode a significant portion of its scientific and technical professional work force. At White Oak Laboratory alone, the move would bring about a 70 percent brain-drain.

All of this would be enough to compel the Commission to have the Navy go back to the drawing board or remove the recommendations entirely. But, what is really at stake here is the policy process. In the 1991 DOD Authorization Act, Congress mandated that the DOD set up a separate Commission to study the conversion and consolidation of defense laboratories. This was done in recognition of the complexity and special nature of defense laboratories, as well as in recognition of their contribution to the defense technology base and the difficulty in reconstituting the laboratory structure and work force once altered or cut altogether. This was also done in recognition that the labs' successes depend largely on the body of highly skilled scientists and engineers who staff the labs and who perform missions that have long-term impact on the technical capabilities of the Armed Forces. No one can dispute that we won the Persian Gulf war on the basis of a technology investment, nor that this investment saved lives. Much of the technology deployed in the Persian Gulf war has begun in the 1970's. To be ready for the next contingency, we can ill afford to hack away at our defense laboratories without first having a Commission with special expertise examining the appropriate future of these labs, both collectively, and individually.

That is why I am encouraged by recent indicators that the Courter Com-

mission may be persuaded by my testimony, and the testimony of at least 60 of my fellow colleagues who have all endeavored to remove laboratories from this list and have them considered by the separate commission for which they were intended. The Commission has included Navy homeports among the 27 bases it has added to the list for alternative consideration. This is extremely encouraging because the GAO said the Navy had excess berthing space and could have either closed additional bases or ceased work on new, uncompleted homeports to save money. Instead, the Navy chose to achieve its cuts through a massive overhaul of its laboratory structure, without providing any reasonable explanation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that the Navy decision regarding White Oak Laboratory is a decision in search of a rationale, one that defies explanation, and one that will result in a net loss to the Navy, the DOD, and the American taxpayer, not in a net savings as the Navy claims, but never demonstrates.

It is my hope that the Courter Commission will not rubberstamp this intolerable decision and will defer a decision to the commission Congress intended for laboratory review. Short of this goal, I have asked the Commission on Base Closures and Realignment to consider some additional recommendations, including, setting aside Navy bases and labs, in particular, until the Navy has explained and documented fairly its decision-making process.

Mr. Speaker, let me now summarize the testimony I made before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission on May 22, 1991. I also want to submit my written testimony for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already noted, the future of the White Oak Laboratory is at stake. It is an essential detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center and is replete with historical advanced technology contributions to Naval wartime and peacetime successes. White Oak Laboratory has been slated for substantial reduction and realignment in Secretary Cheney's April 15, 1991 Base Closure and Realignment Report. The Navy proposal would result in the loss of 1,250 positions, down from 1,800 civilian personnel currently employed at White Oak, leaving 550 people, including research and technology personnel, as well as personnel to operate unique facilities, but no support personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Courter Commission needs to make a thorough and objective examination of the decisions and rationale made to support this recommendation. When it does, the Commission will find, as I did, that the Navy's decisionmaking process is very difficult to track. What can be tracked is inadequately documented and riddled with inconsistencies. These findings are substan-

tiated by the GAO's May 15, 1991 report that evaluated the base closure and realignment selection process.

The Navy plan is short on explanation. Its plan for realigning certain of White Oak's critical missions is incompatible with the Navy's intended goals of mission purification, elimination of duplication, and cost savings. It ignores substantial costs that would render the plan cost ineffective. And although an official White Oak recruiting brochure states, "The single most critical determinant of the success of the Naval Surface Warfare Center is the appropriate selection, development, and retention of highly trained scientists and engineers," the plan virtually assures a massive hemorrhage of critical scientific and technical personnel.

At least 80 percent of the missions performed at White Oak are listed on DOD's and the Office of Science and Technology Policy's critical technology lists. In their 1991 reports to Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy each stressed the importance of R&D and high technology to this Nation's future national security. The Navy's criteria for laboratory restructuring, by preserving all missions currently performed at White Oak as essential leadership areas, indicate that the recommended cuts are driven primarily by a requirement to cut acquisition costs by 20 percent over 5 years and only secondarily by a desire to purify missions to achieve critical mass at four central locations. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Navy plan constitutes a shell game.

The expertise and ingenuity found at White Oak will be vital to the future of our fleet and of our technology base, which we must preserve. Critical research and development requires long lead times and is not easily reconstituted.

In the absence of hard data and a clear explanation by the Navy, I have to conclude, as I said earlier, that the cutback is a decision in search of a rationale. It is clear to me that mission requirements and technical considerations are not driving this proposal. Rather the major consideration seems to be a 20-percent reduction in acquisition force. Yet, Naval industrial funded activities, such as White Oak, are exempt from end-strength considerations. In addition, this plan will not achieve substantial savings. In fact, my cost analysis indicates a net loss to the taxpayer.

The Navy claims that the realignment will have a one-time cost of \$89 million, with projected savings of \$11 million, over 12 years. But, by my own conservative calculations, I arrived at a one-time cost of \$146 million, a 61-percent increase. As you know, the GAO applied a sensitivity cost analysis to all of the costs provided by the services, and most of the figures were unaf-

ected by the GAO's sensitivity analysis. But, in the case of White Oak, when a 50-percent and 100-percent increase in the one-time costs were made, a 100-year payback period was rendered in each case.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded that improved synergy at Dahlgren, the gaining facility, and 11 million dollars' worth of savings 5 years from now, compare favorably with the expected costs, losses in our national scientific and engineering capability, and unwarranted disruption to people, missions, and the economy. Moreover, Dahlgren is not able to receive the additional personnel and equipment without additional facilities, nor is the surrounding community able to house the influx of personnel and their families. Military construction and other costs required to accommodate this realignment are approximately \$100 million. There are also environmental impact costs which add to these costs.

The Navy's anticipated loss of highly-trained scientific and technical personnel from this proposal is great. Past experience indicates a 70-percent non-transfer rate is likely, and a survey of 420 White Oak employees—or 25 percent—indicates an 80-percent non-transfer rate. This projected flight of scientific and technical personnel will have long-term, devastating repercussions to the Navy and the technology base. The direct and indirect costs will be disastrous and intolerable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that such a major realignment in DOD R&D should not occur until the Laboratory Closure and Consolidation Commission can make its review. Moreover, such a shift should not occur until the Navy can adequately document and explain its rationale for doing so to the Commission. Should a downsizing of White Oak be found necessary, I believe that necessary personnel reductions can and should be met by attrition. If the Commission finds that the Navy R&D restructuring plan is appropriate and some realignment should take place on the basis of technical merit and cost-efficiencies, then I would recommend that, at a minimum, the missions of mine warfare and surface ship ASW, along with needed support personnel, remain at White Oak Laboratory. This is imperative in the interest of cost savings, personnel retention, existing synergies at White Oak, and the assurance of preserving these missions for the future of Navy defense needs.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully thank you for the opportunity to discuss this vital topic. I ask for support in defeating the laboratory proposal as it currently exists so that the intent of Congress and the needs of our national security may be met. And, finally, I hope for success in challenging the proposal for White Oak Laboratory, a move that

is clearly not in the best interests of the Navy, the DOD, the employees of White Oak Laboratory, and the American taxpayers.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE CONSTANCE A. MORELLA BEFORE THE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION, MAY 22, 1991

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to discuss the future of White Oak Laboratory, an essential detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC). As you know, White Oak Laboratory, which is located in my Congressional District in Silver Spring, Maryland, has been slated for substantial reduction and realignment in Secretary Cheney's April 15, 1991 Base Closure and Realignment Report.

I want to discuss in some detail my view of the merits and logic of the Navy proposal, which would reduce the number of White Oak Laboratory employees by 20 percent over five years (368 total) and realign 50 percent of the remaining positions (890) to Dahlgren, Virginia. In terms of numbers, the recommendation would result in the loss of 1250 positions, down from 1800 civilian personnel currently employed at White Oak, leaving 550 people, including research and technology personnel, as well as personnel to operate unique facilities.

However, the Navy's recommendation to realign some of White Oak's critical disciplines to Dahlgren is incompatible with the Navy's intended goals of "mission purification," elimination of duplication, and cost savings. Also, the Navy proposal would retain no support personnel for the reduced White Oak staff. Depending on what the Navy plans to do with the impending vacant facilities at White Oak, the shifts may or may not make sense, but most certainly the costs of the proposal would increase. However, no one in the Navy could, or would, tell me what those plans are, although several options are rumored.

The Navy plan is short on explanation. It ignores substantial costs that would render the plan cost-ineffective. And, the plan virtually assures a massive hemorrhage of critical scientific and technical personnel from the Navy, approximately 735 (1050-70 percent=735) personnel are expected to leave due to cuts or unwillingness to transfer, many with an average service length at White Oak of 19 years. In short, the Navy plan for White Oak constitutes a shell game.

I would like the Commission to know that the proposal we are discussing today is revised from a March 19, 1991 Navy document supporting its Base Closure and Realignment Report, Detailed Analysis, that would have cut 1700 positions from White Oak, retaining only 100 personnel as caretakers for White Oak's unique facilities. I am informed that in early April 1991, the Navy shifted to the current proposal after examining the costs of the first proposal, particularly those associated with unique facilities. Thus was born the numerically-driven ceiling of 550 personnel at White Oak Laboratory. Although the Navy states it has been developing the lab plan for more than a year, this plan clearly appears to have been hastily conceived. I also note that the altered plan is reflected in the DOD Base Closure and Realignment report in which Appendix G contains the earlier figures and page 81 contains the final figures.

First, my assessment of the plan's rationale looks at procedural issues, namely:

(1) Why are labs on this list when Congress clearly intended for a separate commission to consider lab closures and consolidations

and the GAO has found the Navy selection process flawed?

(2) Why is the Navy restructuring 90 percent of its R&D structure via this list, when there is excess berthing space at bases to cut according to the GAO? and,

(3) Should R&D be cut proportionate to the rest of the force structure, when most experts agree that in times of shrinking defense dollars it is important to preserve the technology base?

Second, my assessment looks at the stated criteria, namely:

(1) Where is the force structure, top-down, mission analysis that supports the proposed changes to Navy's R&D structure, in general, and for White Oak in particular?

(2) Have the military value, costs, and technical criteria been assessed reasonably? and,

(3) Have personnel, community, and environmental impacts been fairly and accurately assessed?

I offer my alternative analysis for the benefit of our national defense requirements, our defense R&D structure, the employees of White Oak Laboratory, and the greater White Oak community, which falls in my district.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I believe that, in making a thorough and objective examination of the decisions and rationale made to support this recommendation, you will find that the Navy's decision process is very difficult to track. You will also find the Navy's decision-making process to be inadequately documented and riddled with inconsistencies. These findings are substantiated by the May 15, 1991 GAO report that evaluated the base closure and realignment selection process. As you will recall, the GAO concluded:

(1) "First, due to lack of supporting documentation, we could not determine the basis for the Committee's military value ratings for Navy installations."

(2) "Second, we identified apparent inconsistencies within the Committee's internal rating process."

(3) "Lastly, although required by OSD policy guidance to develop and implement an internal control plan for its base structure reviews, the Navy did not assign responsibility for developing and implementing such a plan."

Some of my colleagues will argue that the GAO findings invalidate the entire Navy process. There are certainly a range of alternative recommendations which I will outline later.

I acknowledge that the goals of the overall Navy R&D proposal are conceptually valid; that is, the Navy's intention to create four warfare centers (of which NSWC is one) so as to eliminate duplication and to achieve critical mass is worthy. However, the criteria established to justify the plan do not withstand scrutiny, either from a technical or cost standpoint, and the implementation plan contains many flaws. I want to point out that, since 1974, the two sites, White Oak and Dahlgren have been working together as a corporate center and proximity has not been a factor in either overall center or individual laboratory accomplishments. I base my conclusion on a visit to White Oak, a staff visit to Dahlgren, numerous discussions with management at both White Oak and Dahlgren, overwhelming technical and personal input from employees and constituents, and an in-depth review of data from the DOD, the Navy, the NSWC, the GAO, concerned citizens, and various public sources.

I have a few general comments I want to make for the record as I offer my analysis of

the White Oak Laboratory realignment proposal and my own corresponding recommendations. I will also be submitting supporting documentation for the record.

First, after visiting White Oak, with all of its unique facilities and talented personnel, I cannot help but think that to change this in any way or to make cuts in the vital defense work performed there would be a tragedy to our national security, the Navy, the employees of White Oak, and the Montgomery County community.

I am extremely impressed with the quality and number of high-tech and unique facilities at White Oak. Many are unmatched anywhere in either federal and commercial R&D or the free world. According to an official White Oak publication, the replacement and business base value alone for the seven unique facilities is \$259 million. For four additional facilities deemed important to NSWC leadership areas, the value is \$37 million. The combined total is \$296 million. To its credit, the Navy recognized the value of these facilities and the necessity to retain these capabilities due to their uniqueness and substantial investment.

More importantly, I am struck by the enthusiasm, dedication, and substantive scientific and technical skills of the employees at White Oak Laboratory. An official White Oak recruiting brochure states, "The single most critical determinant of the success of the Naval Surface Warfare Center is the appropriate selection, development, and retention of highly trained scientists and engineers."

According to official White Oak briefing material, of the 1800 civilian employees, 1050 (or 58 percent) are scientists and engineers by discipline. Of these, 400 (or 38 percent) have advanced degrees, many of which were funded by White Oak. In fiscal year 1991, White Oak has budgeted about \$5 million for training, most of which is pursued at eight local area higher education institutes.

It is clear that White Oak is solving problems critical to our nation's defense, as was witnessed in the Persian Gulf War. Some examples are: Mine warfare, Seal weapons and ordnance, conventional ordnance, reduced signature and electromagnetic vulnerabilities, explosives, applied materials, and inputs to the Tomahawk cruise missile. In addition, White Oak, in a joint effort with Dahlgren, was able to design, produce, and deploy to the battlefield a means of distinguishing friendly vehicles from enemy vehicles. This clearly illustrates that the two sister laboratories work well together in times of crisis as they do in times of peace. Finally, at least, eighty percent of the missions performed at White Oak are listed on DOD's and the Office of Science and Technology Policy's critical technology lists.

In their 1991 Reports to Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy each stressed the importance of R&D and high technology to this nation's future national security. The Navy's criteria for laboratory restructuring reflect this emphasis by preserving all missions currently performed at White Oak, calling them "essential leadership areas." I believe that the Commission should conclude from this that recommended cuts are driven primarily by a requirement to cut acquisition costs by 20 percent over five years and only secondarily by a desire to "purify missions" to achieve "critical mass" at four central locations.

The expertise and ingenuity found at White Oak will be vital to the future of our technology base and the fleet. If we fail to

preserve our technology base, which largely depends on the talents of the people in the R&D structure, we may find ourselves even more dependent on foreign sources in the future (currently 17 major weapon systems have critical foreign dependencies) than we are now. Meanwhile, industrial R&D, which already lags behind DOD R&D, is shrinking due to defense cutbacks, making the specter of foreign dependencies more worrisome.

For all of these reasons, I am greatly dismayed and concerned by the recommendation to shift to Dahlgren 50 percent of White Oak staff and resources after making a 20 percent personnel reduction. Such a major shift in DOD R&D should not occur until such time as the Laboratory Closure and Consolidation Commission can make its review. I have co-sponsored a bill to this effect. Moreover, such a shift should not occur until the Navy can adequately document and explain its rationale for doing so to the Commission.

In sum, in the absence of hard data and a clear explanation by the Navy, I have to conclude that the cutback is a decision in search of a rationale. It is clear to me that:

(1) Mission requirements and technical considerations are not driving this proposal. Rather, the major consideration seems to be a 20 percent reduction in acquisition force. Yet, in the same DOD Authorization Act, NIF-funded activities, such as White Oak, are exempt from end-strength considerations.

(2) No savings will be achieved. In fact, my cost analysis indicates that the proposal would actually result in a net loss to the taxpayer.

Without submitting proof, the Navy claims, the White Oak realignment will have a one-time cost of \$89 million, with a projected savings of \$11.2 million. The stated payback period is 12 years. I have been made aware that these numbers were "crunched" many times in order that the result did not render a payback period that would exceed 20 years since a 20-year or more payback period would have rendered the proposed realignment cost-ineffective.

When I performed my own conservative calculations, which I will submit for the record, I came up with a one-time cost of \$146 million (a 61 percent increase). This figure does not include relocation services costs, lost capabilities and skills, costs to recruit and train replacement hires, nor does it include the cost of a new occupant in the vacant space at White Oak, and the cost of maintaining and supporting operating White Oak with reduced personnel (\$11.6 million, a recurring cost that exceeds the Navy's projected recurring savings of \$11.2 million).

The GAO applied a sensitivity cost analysis to all of the costs provided by the services, because some one-time costs were found to have been miscalculated in the 1988 round of closures, thus altering the wisdom of those selections. While most of the figures were unaffected by the GAO's sensitivity analysis, in the case of White Oak, when a 50 percent and 100 percent increase in the one-time costs were made, a 100-year payback period was rendered in each case.

Whether we use my analysis or the GAO analysis, it is clear that when using the higher conservative figures, no savings would be achieved. In any case, I am not persuaded that additional "synergy" gained at Dahlgren and \$11.2 million worth of savings five years from now out of a total of \$1.2 billion in DOD projects to be gained from lab closings and consolidations is worth the price in terms of expected costs, national

scientific and engineering losses, and unwarranted disruption to people, missions, and the economy.

(3) Dahlgren, the gaining facility, is not able to receive the additional personnel and equipment without additional facilities, nor is the surrounding King George community able to house the influx of personnel and their families. Conservative estimates of necessary military construction space at Dahlgren to accommodate the realignment is 300,000 square feet. This would cost roughly \$52 million. I am informed that the Navy reduced these space requirements so that military construction costs would stay within a 20-year payback period ceiling. In any case, trailers will need to be leased immediately in order to accommodate the first transferees, at a cost of \$3 million. A new sewage treatment facility will also be needed within the next year, at a cost of \$33 million. There are also environmental impact costs according to the Navy Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations, Detailed Analysis. And, most importantly, from a standpoint of morale and welfare, there is currently not enough affordable housing for enlisted Aegis personnel assigned to the base, let alone for transferees, and the nearest communities with housing and schools are 45 minutes away (i.e., Fredericksburg, VA and Waldorf, MD).

(4) The first-rate, well-funded, Navy Industrially Funded (NIF) White Oak work, where the demand for services is outpacing supply, will not be improved as a result of this proposed realignment. In addition, many customers and contractors may move their business elsewhere because of probable programmatic disruptions and the loss of 70 percent of the personnel at White Oak.

The potential disruption to fleet deliverables could be enormous. The Navy's anticipated loss of highly-trained scientific and technical personnel is great. Past experience indicates a 70 percent non-transfer rate is likely, and a survey of 420 White Oak employees (or 25 percent) indicates an 80 percent non-transfer rate. This projected flight of scientific and technical personnel to other endeavors as a result of a strong desire not to move or commute to rural Dahlgren (a 75-mile commute from White Oak), will have long-term, devastating repercussions to the Navy and the technology base. The direct and indirect costs would be disastrous and intolerable. I am in favor of a reduced defense budget and structure, but as defense dollars decline, we must be certain that a competitive technology base will be there to preserve our national security for future generations.

Critical research and development requires long lead-times and is not easily reconstituted. It takes an average of three to five years to recruit and train new scientists and engineers, not to mention the 10-plus years it takes to perform at world class levels as do so many of the personnel at White Oak. And, it takes an average of 15 to 20 years to field an advanced weapon system. In times of shrinking defense budgets, research and development dollars should go up or at least hold steady to assure the deployment of superior technology to compensate for fewer systems purchased. This strategy worked amazingly well in the Persian Gulf War and it saved lives. I need not remind this audience that the R&D for many of the "smart" weapons as well as the mainstay weapons used in that war was begun in the 1970s. Given the unique and critical nature of the technology research and development work performed at White Oak Laboratory, it is im-

perative that this proposed realignment be reconsidered.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

First, I recommend that no Department of Defense laboratory be closed or realigned pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as a result of recommendations made by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission during 1991, until the report of the Commission on the Consolidation and Conversion of Defense Research and Development Laboratories has been submitted to Congress pursuant to section 246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

Second, in conjunction with my first recommendation, I recommend that no action be taken by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission with respect to White Oak Laboratory until such time as the Commission on the Consolidation and Conversion of Defense Research and Development Laboratories has had an opportunity to review the White Oak proposal.

Third, also in conjunction with the above, I recommend that no action be taken with respect to White Oak Laboratory until the Department of the Navy develops a plan that meets the GAO standards for nominating facilities for closure or realignment.

Fourth, should a proper and authorized decision be made that it is appropriate to make reductions at White Oak as a result of the Department of the Navy contention that a 20 percent reduction in R&D workforce is necessary pursuant to the Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1991 to cut the acquisition workforce by 20 percent over a five year period, and hence the R&D workforce by 20 percent, then, I recommend that the cuts be made through attrition where feasible and that no realignment to Dahlgren take place.

Fifth, should a proper and authorized decision be made that the Navy R&D restructuring plan is appropriate and that some realignment should take place on the basis of technical merit and cost-efficiencies, then the missions of mine warfare and surface ship ASW should be added to those already selected to remain at White Oak along with some additional support personnel remain at White Oak Laboratory in the interest of cost savings, personnel retention, existing synergies at White Oak Laboratory, and the assurance of preserving these missions for the future of Navy defense needs.

White Oak Laboratory realignment cost analysis

Military construction (based on 1994 funds):		Millions
RDT&E space	\$52	
Sewage treatment plant	33	
Total	85	

Other facility costs (based on 1994 funds):		
Equipment moving expenses	12	
Leased trailers to accommodate immediate realignment of personnel and equipment	3	
Total	15	

BASE OPERATING COSTS (FISCAL YEAR 1990 EXPENSES)

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	White Oak	Dahlgren
Maintenance	\$4.9	\$9.0
Support	33.6	64.5
Total	38.5	73.5

NOTE.—Base operating costs constitute recurring costs. While support costs are to be

eliminated through the realignment of all support functions to Dahlgren, some support for the remaining 550 personnel and operation of unique facilities is anticipated. Though undetermined, this cost will be contracted either from the incoming host to White Oak or from the community. Because 30% of White Oak is being retained, it is assumed that both support and maintenance will cost approximately 30% of the current cost. Thus, \$38.5M minus 70% equals \$11.6M total cost.

PERSONNEL COSTS

Realigned Personnel (Cost: \$30,000 per person).

Assume 30% will move of 890 proposed equals 267 times \$30K equals \$8,010,000.

Severed Personnel (Cost: \$21,000 per person).

Assume 70% will be severed of 890 proposed equals 623 times \$21K equals \$13,083,000.

Assume 100 personnel above normal attrition in conjunction with 20% across-the-board cut (a total of 268—20% of 1800 equals 368—to be cut through either attrition or cuts) will be severed due to 20% across-the-board cut taken before any realignment occurs equals 100 times \$21K equals \$2,100,000.

New Hires (Cost: \$20,000 per person).

Assume 623 needed to make up shortfall (890 minus 267 equals 623) equals 623 times \$20K equals \$12,460,000.

Total: \$8,010,000 plus \$13,083,000 plus \$2,100,000 plus \$12,460,000 equals \$35,653,000.

NOTE.—Does not include relocation services costs, does not take into account lost capability and skills, nor the costs associated to recruit and train new hires.

ADDITIONAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REALIGNED ACTIVITIES

Surface Ship ASW is slated to be moved to Dahlgren. This facility was brought on line in the February-March 1991 timeframe at an overall cost of \$10 million for special construction, equipment, air conditioning and power system.

TOTAL ONE-TIME COSTS

\$100 million plus \$36 million plus \$10 million equals \$146 million.

NOTE.—The Navy estimated that the total one-time costs would be \$89M. The basis for this figure is not explained. Total one-time costs in this analysis exceed Navy projected one-time costs by 61%. A 61% increase in one-time would render a payback period of 100 years.

TOTAL RECURRING COSTS

\$11.6 million.
NOTE.—Recurring costs exceed Navy projected recurring savings of \$11.2M if the plan is implemented as proposed. The basis for this figure is not explained. According to this cost analysis, irrespective of one-time costs, because the recurring costs exceed the recurring savings, the Navy plan will never reap a savings.

WHITE OAK WORKFORCE AND REALIGNMENT PLAN

Currently 1800 civilians; 8 military.
1050 (or 58%) are scientists and engineers, 400 with advanced degrees (or 38%).

Workforce is mainly concentrated in two departments: Research and Technology and Underwater Systems. The remainder are in engineering functions, support, or operators for unique facilities.

Research and Technology consists of: explosives, materials, information sciences, directed energy, and warheads.

Underwater Systems consists of: SQQQ-89, MK 116 ASWCS, Beartrap, mines (exclusive to White Oak), warheads, and seal weapons.

Current plans are to retain the following disciplines only: explosives, underwater warheads, materials, and sensors and radiation (399-20%=319); reentry systems and operators for the wind tunnel (80-20%=64); H department which includes unique facilities (75-20%=60); warheads (140-20%=112).

Total Workforce Retained:
319+64+60+112=550.

By this plan, no support personnel are retained.

By this plan, mines are not retained (136 personnel which are exclusive to White Oak), nor is surface ship ASW (135 personnel and a new \$10 million facility specially designed and recently put on line (February-March 1991)). Surface ship ASW is being realigned to Dahlgren to integrate with other anti-warfare disciplines. Both mines and surface ship ASW will most assuredly lose 70% of their personnel based on past experience, informal surveys, and letters received. This would result in a loss (271-70%=81 personnel would most likely transfer to Dahlgren and 190 personnel would leave the NSWC). In addition, this would result in the lost investment cost in building space and non-transferable equipment.

What is most alarming about the loss associated with these two disciplines is that they are essential mission areas and are difficult specialties to recruit and train. In the case of mines, it was one of only two Navy deficiencies cited in the Persian Gulf war and a technology area cited as critical to future Navy defense needs. While synergy would be achieved in the case of surface ship ASW by the move to Dahlgren, at the expense of the lost costs and moving and military construction costs, there is no synergy to be gained with the movement of mines to Dahlgren. Mines is a discipline unique to White Oak and is a matrix organization in which synergy is achieved at White Oak via interaction with the research department and the underwater systems department.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to prohibit the expansion of longer combination vehicles [LCV's] on America's highways. H.R. 2515 would ban double- and triple-combination trucks in States that do not currently allow them.

If you wonder what it's like to share the interstate with one of these giant trucks, imagine a 10-story building laid on its side and you've got a good picture of the length of some LCV's.

Statistics show that public safety is compromised by LCV's. According to the Transportation Research Board, combination trucks have twice the rate of fatal accident involvement as passenger cars. And, while larger trucks make up only 3.2 percent of traffic, they are responsible for 12 percent of highway deaths.

It's no wonder most Americans don't want these huge rigs lumbering down the same highways on which they travel with their loved ones. Riding next to a truck 120 feet long is an intimidating experience. That's why over three-quarters of the American people oppose more LCV's on our highways.

Furthermore, without a ban on the expansion of LCV's, States that do not currently per-

mit them will be forced—out of economic necessity—to join neighboring States in allowing them on their roads.

In 1956, Congress enacted legislation limiting the size of trucks on the Interstate System. It granted exemptions to a few States which were already permitting larger trucks. But the number of exemptions has multiplied to the point where there is a legal loophole large enough to drive a truck through.

Today, 15 States permit triple 28-foot trailers, 17 States permit twin 48-foot trailers, and 20 States allow "Rocky Mountain doubles," which consist of one 48-foot trailer and one 28-foot trailer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must safeguard American motorists and their passengers as well as the public investment in our highways. Until we know more about the safety of LCV's, we should err on the side of protecting the public. H.R. 2515 will do just that. I hope you will join me in this effort.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 60 minutes I had reserved for a special order previously be reinstated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1, THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is sad and dismaying that 27 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we are still trying to secure equal rights for all of our citizens. You would think that we would have moved beyond this now to solve other problems. Yet, instead of building on the solid foundation of the original Civil Rights Act, we have retreated from the letter and intent of that law.

We need not rehash our Nation's history of racial discrimination in employment that gave rise to Federal statutes such as section 1981, passed in 1888, over a hundred years ago, and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is clear though, that they were passed because of the undeniable pervasiveness of job-related discrimination. Unfortunately, these laws were not able to single-handedly eliminate employment discrimination. The continued occurrence of these problems is well-known and well documented. Race, as well as gender, religion, and national origin, continue to figure into management decisionmaking regarding hiring, promotions, layoffs, firings, and day to day concerns.

It is interesting that a few weeks ago the Urban Institute released the results of an extensive study of hiring

bias. The results of the study were disturbing to say the least: Blacks were three times as likely as whites to face discrimination in the hiring process. But the reaction—or lack thereof—has been even more unsettling. After a flurry of articles, that was it. That was all there was to it.

No discussion, no debate, no laments, and most unfortunate of all, the study's results provided no impetus for passage of the civil rights bill. As if the race-baiting hysteria over the bill were not enough, this is further proof that for far too many people, equal rights for minorities and women is just not an item high on the agenda.

It was certainly not on the Supreme Court's agenda when it engaged in unprecedented judicial activism and curtailed well-established rights and remedies under section 1981 and title VII. Previous Court decisions were overruled and new interpretations were artfully crafted. The net result is that the Court disregarded both the letter and the spirit of Congress' efforts, thus doing damage to the legitimate rights of millions of Americans.

Well I am here to tell you that all forms of racial and sexual discrimination are intolerable, as are the Supreme Court's decisions turning back the clock on progress and justice.

□ 1740

Just what is equality worth if it only applies in theory? What are employment protections worth if they are unenforceable? What are judicial remedies worth if the path to justice is obstructed with insurmountable barriers? Absolutely nothing, but to give hope of fairness where there really is none and to engage in a charade of democratic practices where they do not actually exist.

This weekend, the Nation's Capital will host a grand homecoming victory celebration for our troops from Operation Desert Storm. Parades, giveaways, awards, parties and special deals have taken place all across the country for the past 3 months. Let me note that a survey conducted by the Chicago Reporter found that 80 percent of all military recruits in the Chicago area are minorities. They fought for the freedom and liberation of the Kuwaiti people and achieved stunning success. Based on the results of the Urban Institute study, and what we already knew to be true, we can conclude that they may very likely not have the same success in their daily struggle for economic freedom and equal justice at home. As long as we shut out these young men and women from the very opportunities and freedoms for which they have so recently fought, we, as a nation dishonor them and their sacrifice.

The Civil Rights Act of 1991 overturns five major Supreme Court decisions: *Wards Cove* versus *Atonio*, *Price*

Waterhouse versus Hopkins, Martin versus Wilks, Lorraine versus AT&T, and Patterson versus McLean Credit Union.

With discrimination complaints of all kinds nationwide on the rise, now is not the time to retreat. With the Supreme Court departing further and further from established principles of equality, now is not the time to be reticent. As the Congress of the United States, we must take the lead in upholding the basic, essential rights of all Americans. We must pass the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for taking this time to point out how very basic this civil rights bill is. I think it is ludicrous for even having a debate on this in 1991. This is really a housekeeping amendment. It is just correcting from Supreme Court decisions that went way off track, and putting the law back on track the way it was in the 1970's and early 1980's.

To see all the brouhaha made about it is amazing. It says to me they do not want civil rights, they want an issue, they want a political issue.

I think polarizing this Nation at this time is unbelievable. I also think that the first bill we have is the fairest. It looks most like the one we started with, dealing with the five different cases and restoring the law, plain and simple, period.

It does not put caps on people, which I find shocking. I find it shocking that they want to put caps on people and start saying that some kind of discrimination is worse than other kinds of discrimination.

To me, that goes right to the heart of what civil rights is about. But I think basically what you are seeing is the President of the United States really almost egging on civil unrest. I would much rather have civil rights than civil unrest. All of these decisions go to jobs, jobs are where you get your dignity in America. It is a country where we do not say, "Who are you?" We say, "What do you do?" If you say, "Nothing," it means nothing.

It is also a day where the children's defense fund came out with some very important statistics, and I think those statistics show why the civil rights bill is very important to families.

They point out that the average American thinks that the average person on welfare is a young black living in the urban core with a mother who is on welfare who had him in her teens. Well, guess what; among the poor children in America, that is only 1 in 56, 1 in 56.

So the image we have does not fit poor children at all. Most of them have

a parent struggling to work, struggling to get ahead.

We know that women have been discriminated against in the workplace. The gentlewoman from Illinois has worked on that forever, whether it is pay equity, sex discrimination, sexual harassment, all across the board.

Many of these women are mothers who have kids that are impoverished. We know that men have been discriminated against in the workplace. What we have done to black males in this country has been unbelievable. Many of those are fathers, and they are trying to make it.

We know there are Hispanics, we know there are many others who have been discriminated against.

I wish the President of the United States would use his position to pull us all together and then go out and fight this economy and get it back on its feet so that everybody has a job and everybody has the dignity that goes with a job.

Nobody wants to be on welfare.

As I say, I keep reminding people only 1 in 56 fits the majority stereotype of the poor child.

All the rest of the parents are struggling and trying to do something to get out of poverty and to make their lives better. But if you look at the eighties, what happened to families is that every family in America, if the head of the family was 35 years old or younger, is worse off unless they were in the top 5 percent of the income range, they are worse off than they were at the beginning of the eighties.

So this is about jobs, and this is about their ability to get into decent jobs, and this is about their ability to progress once they get into decent jobs so there are not ceilings for people of different backgrounds. It is about not allowing businesses to duck all the responsibilities by saying, "Well, we would like to promote women," or, "We would like to promote African Americans," or "Hispanics or Asian Americans," but, "business necessity."

If they can hide behind business necessity and not have to prove what they mean by it, then there will not be another civil rights case ever won in the history of this country. That is what that is all about.

So the gentlewoman from Illinois is making such a good point, and I really hope that tomorrow people will back the purest civil rights bill and send a real message to the White House that we have had it, we have had it with their playing political games with this. We want the country pulled together, not pulled apart, and we want this being dealt with at the high level that Abraham Lincoln would want us to.

If he is sitting down there in his chair in his monument right now, I am sure he is smiling if he hears this debate. I do not know what he is going to

be doing tomorrow when he hears the other one.

To think that this many years after the Civil War and think that we are still having this kind of debate over the very basic dignity of being able to have a job and being treated fairly in the workplace is just amazing to me.

So I support totally what the gentlewoman is saying. I thank her for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I will be on the floor tomorrow supporting civil rights fully, and I hope others do too, and I hope we get a wake-up call to America saying, "If you were as horrified as I was by what happened in India as you watched it all, polarizing groups, going against each other," or, "If you are as horrified as I am after seeing what is happening in some of the Eastern-bloc nations with all sorts of antieverything, raising its ugly head again, and groups starting to fight and countries starting to come unraveled, then let us not do that here."

The one thing we have right now that the world wants is we have learned how to really bring diversity out and make it a positive.

There are two areas in our economy where we have really allowed everybody to participate, and in those two areas we are second to none.

Area No. 1 is entertainment. There is no other country in the world that provides the entertainment that we do. When you look at the wide range of shows, where else could you go and have a Sylvester Stallone and a Bill Cosby and a Gloria Esteban, and you could go on, and Madonna, those are unique, and that is everybody out there, and it has made a global impact. All over the globe they turn to us for entertainment, our music, our sitcoms, our movies, Everybody is there. All you have to have there is talent.

And sports: We let everybody play in sports, and we have some doggone good teams that can take on the world.

We have also made more progress in the military than we have in the private sector. It is easier to get an advancement in the military than in the private sector. Now, that is crazy.

This bill is about finally opening up the private sector so as we move into a global economy and a globe that is clearly diverse, you would think the private sector would really want to flourish with this diversity as we have in other areas and understand the way that we broke into those markets and the way we really do things a lot of other countries have trouble doing is to use the people that came from those different places to help us make those bridges in trade, finance, and all the things that we need to get on with, instead of fighting to the bitter end to make sure that everybody in the world looks like Peter Preppie or they cannot play.

So, thank you. I will be here. We will vote. I appreciate your pointing this out, and I appreciate your very hard work in all of this.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her kind remarks because she has certainly been one who has been very interested in seeing that this legislation is passed.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

□ 1750

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for yielding to me. I want to join with the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in the accommodation she has given the gentlewoman in the well for taking this special order to provide each of us an opportunity to speak out in support of the Towns-Schroeder substitute to H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is a pure, civil rights bill, without the compromises included in the Brooks-Fish substitute. In other words, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is essentially the same as H.R. 4000, last year's civil rights bill, as reported out of the Education and Labor Committee in May 1990. There are, however, two additional provisions:

First, it adds a provision to prohibit discrimination against women in the making and enforcing of contracts; and

Second, it extends the coverage of title VII of the civil rights act of 1964 to American workers employed by American-owned companies abroad.

A key feature of the Towns-Schroeder substitute is that it authorizes compensatory and punitive damages in title VII cases, without the cap on punitive damages included in the Brooks-Fish substitute. There is no legitimate reason to deny women, religious minorities, and the disabled the same, effective remedies as racial minorities are now provided. The Towns-Schroeder substitute ensures equal treatment for all victims of intentional employment discrimination. Furthermore, by strengthening the remedies available to all victims of discrimination, this provision provides more effective deterrence.

Since punitive damages are only available in cases of egregious intentional discrimination, this provision would not lead to multimillion-dollar lawsuits. Moreover, the complaining party must show either malice or callous disregard by an employer in order to obtain punitive damages. Thus, this provision would not lead to more litigation.

While the Towns-Schroeder substitute does not mandate quotas in any fashion, it does not contain explicit language prohibiting the use of quotas. Last year, to no avail, there were over

37 painstaking efforts to placate the administration by adding specific, compromise amendments addressing the quota argument. President Bush still vetoed the civil rights bill.

In view of the administration's interference in April, when the Business Roundtable was very close to agreement with civil right groups on a compromise bill, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the quota argument is still nothing but a smoke screen. In fact, there was no resort to quotas as the law existed for 18 years under Griggs and prior to the Supreme Court decisions of 1989 which changed the Griggs standard. Not one individual has offered evidence to support the assertion that quotas would result because of the technical changes in the law. To state that the civil rights bill produces quotas, when it does not, is nothing more than Willie Horton-style, racial politics, which was the bedrock for George Bush's ascendancy into the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, the Towns-Schroeder substitute simply states what ought to be obvious—under no circumstances will discrimination in the workplace be tolerated in our society. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Towns-Schroeder substitute for H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], and I will be brief because I know she has other speakers, for taking out this special order on the Towns-Schroeder substitute and on the Civil Rights Act period.

Mr. Speaker, I was very startled to hear some of the President's comments over the weekend, and frankly it may not have been malicious, but I was offended when the President used the analogy of comparing our bill to a pig compared to a horse. To me I do not think we talk in terms of the civil rights of American people in those terms. I think, when one considers the fact that some of the laws that the Supreme Court usurped go back to 1866, some of those laws that in the five decisions of 1989 that the Supreme Court made relative to discrimination and job discrimination, and that some of the laws also go back to the Civil Rights Act, title 7, 1964, we are talking about people's lives.

The majority of people in the work force frankly happen to be women, and disabled Americans, and black Americans, and other individuals of religious minorities, and they would like something very obvious: their full rights under the law protected, and that is something that the Reagan and Bush Supreme Court decided was not quite right, and that is why Congress is a separate, but equal, branch of Govern-

ment and has a responsibility, I believe, to correct what, once again, the Supreme Court did. We had to do this I believe 3 or so years ago when we passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act. That was an act to restore title 9 of the Civil Rights Act, an act that had passed almost a generation ago. I think we are going backward, not forward, and we are trying, some of us are trying, to achieve the status quo, and that is to restore some of these laws that the Supreme Court decisions have, I believe, misinterpreted.

So, I want to thank my colleague from Chicago, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], for all of her wonderful work, and, hopefully, when the bills do come before the floor, we will pass the Towns-Schroeder bill which in my judgment is the fairest of the options we have to restore the civil rights of every American, irrespective of who that individual is, so that the morale, and the productivity and the access to employment can be equal for all Americans, and I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] very much, and she is certainly absolutely right. As the gentlewoman knows, we did have to go through the Civil Rights Restoration Act a decade ago. We found ourselves having to go over to pass a civil rights bill after emancipation was passed in 1863. I just wonder how long is our country going to take a step forward and four steps backward. Hopefully this act will show everybody who is interested in knowing that we really are very serious about it, our civil rights, and I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for all of the work that she has done in this regard.

Ms. OAKAR. Would the gentlewoman from Illinois yield for just one more second?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. One of the reasons I support the Towns-Schroeder bill is that there is no cap on the punitive damages for women, disabled individuals, and religious minorities. Forty-five percent of the work force are apt to be female, and 37 million Americans are disabled, et cetera, and it seems to me that it sends the wrong signal to cap certain areas, if you happen to be female, or disabled, or a religious minority, and I am so delighted that so many individuals who feel that way happen to be minorities who would not be affected by that cap, and I think that shows the magnitude of all of our beliefs, that we really believe in civil rights for everyone, and that is the whole spirit of what the law is about, and let us hope that the Schroeder-Towns vote gets a very, very strong vote tomorrow.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], my dear colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in ardent support of the Towns-Schroeder substitute for the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Legislation very similar to the Towns-Schroeder substitute received the support of 273 votes last year when it was introduced as H.R. 4000, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1990. This substitute amendment codifies the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and restores what was lost by the recent Supreme Court decisions overturning substantive measures that protected the employment rights of African-Americans.

The Towns-Schroeder substitute dispels among other things, the misconception of quotas and removes the unfair practice of placing caps on damages for women, religious minorities, and disabled persons. This amendment also preserves the discriminatory impact test advised by the Wards Cove decision. It places the burden of proof on the employer to demonstrate the business necessity of the practice that has a disparate impact on the basis of race, ethnic origin, religious affiliation, or gender.

The Congressional Black Caucus has brought a substitute amendment to the floor that is all about fairness, equality, and basic common sense. If the truth be told, African-Americans have not, nor have they ever been treated equally in this country. That is a sad testament for a people who have plowed America's fields, expanded the profit margin of America's industries through productivity, and broadened the focus of science, medicine, history, art, and music. Let's not also forget that African-Americans are by far, one of the largest group of consumers in the Nation.

African-Americans have earned the right to be treated as equal citizens in every venue of prosperity this country has to offer. We are not asking for preferential treatment from anyone or anything. We do however, expect and demand equal treatment under the laws of our Constitution. Equal employment and fair employment practices are an integral part of that package.

Section 5 of the Town-Schroeder substitute addresses the fairness issue for all employees by providing a provision that prohibits intentional discriminations with a provision that specifically states that an employer is liable under title II. This is effective if the employee demonstrates that race, religion, ethnic origin, or gender was the motivating factor in him or her receiving unsatisfactory treatment or termination of services from his or her employer. This common-sense approach to fair employment practices that has set

the Bush administration and its racially motivated rhetoric on civil rights issues on its ear.

In the battle of civil rights, President Bush has been speaking to our Nation's college graduates about civil rights laws that address the issue of "equal morality." He speaks of less Government interference and stronger responsibilities of moral values promoted in the workplace by the employer. Unfortunately, African-Americans have always known that there is no equal morality or equal opportunity when it comes to employment in the American work force.

Mr. Bush's confusion about the economic plight of African-Americans and their inability to compete fairly in the labor market is a direct result of his lack of understanding of the disparity of the American work force. If I were to make a comparison of the difference between President Bush and myself, I would surmise that President Bush and those like him lack understanding of the need to restore civil rights law because they grew up in America being equal. I and those like me, understand the need for passing this vital legislation because we grew up in America being black.

The Department of Labor's 1990 unemployment rate between African-American men and white men indicates that the unemployment rate of African-American men was 10.1 percent, over twice as high as compared to the 4.2 percent unemployment rate for white men. In the last month the April 1991 unemployment rates for African-American men stands at 12 percent compared to that of 5.5 percent of white men. Things are definitely not improving.

It is therefore understood that from the President's perspective, equality is in effect asking for a quality of life he already has. From the African-American's perspective, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is the vehicle needed to replace the steps lost in the climb to equal employment opportunity and gives us a chance at the same quality of life as white Americans.

Opponents of the civil rights legislation talk about the need to cap civil damages against the practitioners of racial and gender segregation. Caps are a red-herring issue that is both unnecessary and discriminatory to women, those of different religious affiliation, and the disabled. A 1991 study conducted by the law firm of White & Case for the National Women's Law Center concluded that over a 10-year period, from 1981 to 1991, 576 race related cases of discrimination were reported to the courts. Of the 576 cases reported, 93 cases were awarded damages. Of these, 62 cases received compensatory and punitive damages combined, of less than \$50 thousand. Only four cases during the entire 10-year period received damages over \$200,000.

Finally, on the question of quotas. This is not a quota bill. Plain and simple. The Towns-Schroeder substitute amendment very clearly states that it does not affect or change any law governing affirmative action. The amendment in no way mandates a quota system. So, if President Bush is successful in duping the American public by consistently repeating the blatant falsehood that the democrats are supporting quotas, he only reinforces the concept that a lie told often enough, with enough media attention, will be acknowledged as the truth. Even when the truth is obvious for all to see.

Let's face the facts. A national economic recession, increased racial tension, enhanced by recent Supreme Court decisions and a President insensitive to the needs of a huge population of voters, have set the civil rights movement and equal opportunity for all Americans back some 20 years.

If we do not restore what was lost in those Supreme Court decisions, this Nation runs the risk of social, economic, and political deterioration. One look at the rebellion and revolutionary activities of other nations whose people suffer from economic and political oppression will tell you that ignoring the obvious injustice will be allowing history to repeat itself in our own backyard.

Congress must right the wrongs of the Supreme Court and dispel the President's myth that America has obtained equality for all of its citizens. This substitute amendment is our chance to do so. The time to address equal employment concerns is overdue and we must act now.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to consider their vote, to talk about it, to discuss it, and to act on the Towns-Schroeder substitute. It is extremely important that we do that, and I urge the Members to cast their vote for the substitute. It is extremely important that we do that, and I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for allowing us to use this time to further provide a platform for the discussion of this most important issue.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for her remarks because she is right on target as usual, and we are delighted that she has had the opportunity to be with us on this piece of legislation. We are delighted that she knows it so well and has been so exceedingly proficient at giving us her views on this issue because they are helpful to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

□ 1810

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we should provide the same

remedies of all people who are the victims of intentional job discrimination.

It is simply un-American that women, religious minorities, disabled persons or those of different national origins, are subject to a cap on the amount of punitive and compensatory damages they may receive, while racial minorities, who are similarly situated, are not subject to a cap.

Currently, back pay is the exclusive monetary remedy available under title VII and it has not served as an effective deterrent for employers.

Making employers liable for all losses—economic and otherwise—as a result of prohibited discrimination, proven at trial, will serve as a deterrent to future acts of discrimination for both those held liable for the damages, as well as the entire employer community as a whole.

Many of the opponents of the expansion of title VII's remedial scheme argue that by doing so, we would "open the floodgates" to many frivolous lawsuits, produce multimillion dollar lawsuits and discourage voluntary settlement of cases.

All of these statements are simply not true.

Filing a lawsuit against an employer is a tremendous undertaking with many personal and professional ramifications, and it is not a process that is entered into lightly.

If we use section 1981, which provides compensatory and punitive damages to victims of intentional racial discrimination, as an example, we will find some statistics that will directly speak to the question of potential frivolous lawsuits.

There have been very few cases where damages have been awarded under section 1981. In only 69 cases nationwide, over the last 10 years, were compensatory or punitive damages awarded.

In 42 of those cases where it was possible to determine the exact amount of the damages award, the combined compensatory and punitive award per case was \$50,000 or less. In 4 cases, plaintiffs received less than \$500.

Moreover, only in 3 cases was a plaintiff ultimately awarded more than \$200,000 combined compensatory and punitive damages.

By looking at these statistics, it is clear that people have not won large lawsuits and that by providing a chance for women, the disabled, religious minorities and those of different national origins, to receive damages free from any caps, we will not produce a "lawyer's bonanza"; it will simply put them on the same footing as victims of intentional racial discrimination.

For too many years, the contributions that American women made to our Nation were undervalued and even ignored.

It is unfortunate that in 1991, at a time women have made dramatic ad-

vances and important contributions in all fields, we are still debating whether or not to give them their full rights as citizens.

In recent years, more and more women have laid their lives on the line for the betterment of our country. A great source of inspiration to us all was Christine McAuliffe, the young school teacher who lost her life trying to carry out a space shuttle mission to provide us with more knowledge about our universe.

When President Bush made the decision that the United States would go to war in order to end the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, women in military service answered the call of duty. Over 30,000 women served in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Many left husbands, children and comfortable homes behind, yet we did not hear them complain as they headed for the rigors of a desert halfway around the world.

Sadly, some of our American women—including one from my home State of New Jersey—did not return. They made the ultimate sacrifice. Another young woman was held against her will as a prisoner of war.

Are we now going to tell these women—even as we plan elaborate homecoming parades for them—that they have not earned the right to receive full protection under our American laws? Is this how we reward them for their patriotism?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this unequal treatment for women is the right thing for us to do. It is not the direction we should be taking in 1991, when so many women are contributing so much to the betterment of our society.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply an issue of equity and fairness.

The Towns/Schroeder substitute is the only bill that will treat all victims of intentional job discrimination equally and equality is what America is all about.

I urge all Members to support the Towns/Schroeder substitute.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for pointing out the tremendous job that women in Desert Storm and Desert Shield did. I also thank the gentleman for the job he has done in trying to help fashion this legislation and giving it his support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the leadership that has been shown by the gentlewoman in the well in organizing this special order so that we may take time to emphasize those points that we treasure with regard to the debate that is to ensue tomorrow on the Civil Rights Act.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], with whom I feel privileged to serve. He has cer-

tainly pointed out all the salient reasons why any suggested tack on to any bill which would limit the rights of women is not only unfair, but is simply not a part of the concept of equal justice under the law, nor should it even be considered as part of the civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am really very sad and chagrined to know that tomorrow we will be debating two substitutes that will in fact put caps on the rights of women to go before a court of law and feel totally entitled, based upon an analysis of their own individual case, for the courts and juries to determine what their just damages ought to be.

Instead, the Congress, under these two other substitutes, will be putting limitations on as to what the courts can find. Therefore, Members of the House and people who are watching this program, there is really only one bill that to my estimation measures up to what American justice is all about, and that is H.R. 4000, which is going to be the first substitute that will come up for a vote tomorrow. It will basically be the bill that was reported out of committee last year, and, pretty much like the bill that we fashioned in the Committee on Education and Labor and in the Committee on Judiciary this year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the basic concept of trying to restore in place the decisions that came down by the Supreme Court in 1989 that reversed the traditions of the past, and, in addition, raises the question about equity in terms of title VII damages.

Up until now, and a result of provisions and limitations as have been interpreted under title VII, women, religious minorities, and, recently added to title VII, the disabled of America, would not be, except for the provisions of the civil rights law, entitled to the full range of damages that any other plaintiff coming before the courts alleging discrimination at the workplace would be, and being able then to have the courts decide what sort of damages they are entitled to receive.

Under title VII, the remedies were what they described to be equitable only, which meant back wages or reinstatement. There was no possibility of compensatory damages and no possibility of punitive damages.

Under H.R. 1, out of all of the committees, and in H.R. 4000, for the first time, we have this ability of women finally going to the courts and being able to carry their litigation on discrimination, having the courts find intentional discrimination, and being able to recover not only back wages and reinstatement, but their full justice of compensatory damages, and, in the case of egregious, overt, deliberate kinds of discrimination, to be able to have the courts decide on punitive damages.

What the other two substitutes do, which is a tremendous blow really to the concept of equity, is to put a limit on the amount of damages that these plaintiffs can receive. In the case of the Brooks-Fish substitute, it would put a limit of \$150,000 on punitive damages.

A lot of people say well, that should be enough. Besides, it is not \$150,000, because it could be higher if the compensatory damages should be higher.

□ 1820

That is to say that there is no trust and confidence in a court of law to make a reasonable decision after looking at individual cases. And that is what is so egregious about the notion of putting a cap because it says everybody is alike insofar as their suffering and insofar as how the employer has treated them. We know for a fact that is not true. Therefore, this whole concept of limitation I find is so difficult to accept.

On the Michel substitute, which is the one that the minority is coming forth with, it does not recognize the whole area of discrimination at the workplace because it says in their bill that only sex harassment cases can come to court for damages and then not quite damages because they do away with the jury system and they call it an extension of equitable remedy. And so their case is woefully inadequate; their bill is woefully inadequate and does not really deserve any consideration if you are truly looking at this concept of equity.

I feel so strongly that any bill that is called a civil rights act, should be within it consistent, and carry forth the notion that people in America should be treated alike. I think what has swept over us in our anxiety to correct the wrongs that were put upon the law by the Supreme Court, is to want to make sure that we have enough votes in this body to override the veto of the President. And in so doing, we have tried to make this concession, that concession, hoping that along the way we would gather enough votes in order to overcome the President.

The thing that we have to remember is that it is the President that is making this terrible mistake in going to the American people and saying this bill is not worthy of consideration or support, threatening a veto, not looking at the particular aspects of the legislation. This President is the first President to veto any civil rights bill. He did that last year. We added this cap in order to try to make it possible for him to sign it into law, and he did not.

We are now faced with that same dilemma, and I am here to ask this House, this body, to consider the basics of what we want to have fashioned into our civil rights legislation. What is it that is so elemental as to express the philosophy and the commitment of this

country? I see no other legislation before us that truly conforms to that ideal. So I hope that as we debate the alternatives tomorrow, that all of the eyes of the Congress, people who are interested truly in civil rights in America, as well as the American people will look to H.R. 4000, give it full support, and the measure of support that we get for H.R. 4000 will be extremely important as the bill goes over to the Senate.

So I hope that the Members of the House will listen to the debate, understand the importance of the differences between the substitutes and come down strong for equity in America, equal opportunity for everyone, and more importantly, the concept of equal justice which is really the cornerstone of liberty and freedom in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] will be recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this portion of the proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives is what is known as special orders. I, like most Members, think that it should be rarely used for special purposes, and I have not been here long enough to know why it is called special orders, but I would like to think that at least for the time that Members and I are spending here talking about the civil rights bill this evening, it is a special time.

I do not have prepared remarks, and I would give notice at this time that I would like to share the opportunity with other Members who wish to come over, whether they are for or against the civil rights bill, or for or against one version or another, because I truly do believe that the more excellent way to get the people in this country to understand the many bright people who are here is for us to take time every once in a while to talk to each other, rather than at each other.

The people who elected us and the people out in the country are not stupid, and they know that most of the time when they see us engaged in debate, it fits the definition of debate in only the loosest sense of that word, that we never take the opportunity to engage each other intellectually to discuss the merits of matters. We give what our version is. We do not attempt to convince other people.

So if there are a few Members of the Republican persuasion, or perhaps some Democrats, who plan to vote against the civil rights bill, who have

any questions in their mind about what the bill contains, who think that it is a quota bill and they are going to go back and tell their constituents they voted for it because it was a quota bill or because it did not contain this or did not contain that, we are going to take the rug off this evening. All they need to do is come over here to this floor for the next hour and they can engage at least one person and perhaps, I think, others who genuinely know what this bill is, who make no claim about its shortcomings or its benefits, but who are willing to discuss with any Member from Congressman HYDE on down, if he is watching television, I would ask him to come over. Those who intend to hide behind the use of the word "quota," if there is any intellectual honesty about the position that they take, then now is the time to come over and make their point.

For the next hour I will be here, along with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. KOPETSKI, and the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, and the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, and others who will be coming by, because I think that the people in their districts deserve an honest answer to something as fundamental as this.

They allow us to play politics with a lot of things, but this is not a subject about which politics ought to be played. It should not matter who is President of the United States or who is going to win the next election. There are people out in this country who are suffering because we have laws that have been interpreted so negatively as to be so restrictive as to not give them the fundamental right that everybody in this country believes that people are entitled to.

Let us set the backdrop then for our discussion. I have brought along lots of material here, and I would be happy to engage anyone on the question of race norming, any other issue that they legitimately think is of a topical concern. I invite them to come out of their offices and come on over to the floor of the House of Representatives and let us engage in a little friendly debate, because I honestly do believe in the bottom of my heart of hearts that I am right about this bill. And I honestly do believe that those who claim to support a bill are wrong, but if they are right, now is the time to be man enough and woman enough to come over here in the clear light of day while the television is on, while their constituents are looking, and not make one of those cockamamie speeches where you are talking up there to the camera, but talk to a real live person who will yield some time and give them an opportunity to engage in colloquy, because the people of this country want to know what is right and

what is wrong with the civil rights bill. I hope that we will be able to spend a little time this evening discussing why we think this bill ought to pass.

Let us go back and remember who we are and where we are and how we got here. This country was founded 215 years ago by a rag-tag group of individuals, malcontent and the like, who came here from all parts of the world. They conceived of the notion that this country would be founded upon the principle that all persons are created equal and that they are endowed, not by the government, but by their Creator with certain rights that no one can take away. An inalienable right means one that cannot be alienated by many but only by God. These colonies then had the unmitigated gall to declare themselves a rebellion in fact, free and independent of the wishes and dictates of the King of England. It was a latter-day resurrection.

□ 1830

They formed a compact. They called it the Declaration of Independence. They set out in that document which amounted to an indictment of the conditions with which they had found themselves, largely due to economic circumstances, largely having to do with where they had come from, principally from Europe, but with one common idea, that is, that regardless of one's previous condition or circumstance, regardless of what one's heritage was, that all people in the eyes of God and in the eyes of the law of this country were equal.

They then formed a Constitution after they fought a war with England. They formed a Constitution that set themselves apart, the second of which is still in existence after the Articles of Confederation, and it has been amended a few times, but not that often.

I think that most people would agree that it is a rather pliable document, but there are certain fundamental things that are set out in that document. That document guarantees certain rights to the individual to be protected from the Government. They guarantee the intercourse or interaction between individuals so that all persons will be treated equal under the law. Most of us remember that as part of the debate on whether the Constitution should be adopted by these new-formed colonies that formed this Union that was called the United States of America, that there was great discussion about the interplay between the role of government having been visited upon a strong centralized form of government in the personage of England. These new colonies that formed the United States of America certainly did not want to find themselves in the same situation by creating a Presidency that was in effect a monarchy, so that there were limitations put on the Federal Government, and all rights

not given to the Federal Government by the Constitution were reserved to those several States which were 13 in number at the time, or to the people.

The most important part of the equation from the founding of this country for the last 215 years has been the people, and when any part of the people in this country suffer, it is in contemplation of fact, and at least in theory, that all people in this country suffer. All people in this country suffered when citizens in this country of Asian-American extraction were rounded up and put in prison camps after the beginning of World War II. It was not just something that was visited upon them. It was visited upon the heart and the soul of this country.

All people in this country suffered from the time that the Supreme Court of the United States misinterpreted the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments in the reconstruction act passed after the end of slavery, after the war that was fought that we called the Civil War.

The Congress set out to follow the mandates of the great reconstitution, if you will, of what the Constitution actually meant. It made it clear from that point forward, it could be argued from the beginning until the Civil War, that there were two standards of conduct allowable under our Constitution, because that was, in fact, what the Supreme Court had determined, that blacks were three-fifths of a person and the like.

But the reason for visiting these points in history is not to resurrect those memories but to set the course for the discussion that we find it necessary to have here this evening. The Supreme Court, in the trilogy of cases called the slaughterhouse cases, the civil rights cases and, most notably, Plessy versus Ferguson, set back democracy as we know it from 1896 until 1945 when the Supreme Court finally decided that separate but equal was not and could not be constitutional under our Constitution.

I speak not in behalf of black people. I speak in behalf of all people, because if we are one country, then we have to be one people, and we cannot be one people when we allow either through politics or race or religion or any other circumstance to divide ourselves one from another. If we are going to be one country, and we are not, then we need to move ahead in the matter of civil rights and not behind.

Since 1989 we have been in a holding pattern with respect to civil rights, and it usually befalls us that most black Members find it necessary to come to the well and speak on behalf of civil rights. I am happy to see my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon here, because he understands that none of us are free until and unless all of us are free. This is not a black-white issue. This is not a gender issue. This is an American issue.

This is one of the few days that I decided to wear a flag on my lapel. I do not like to wear my patriotism on my lapel, but there is nothing more American under our Constitution, under the Declaration of Independence and all the laws that we profess to hold so dearly, there is nothing more American than the concept that no matter who you are, or where you come from, or what color you are, or what religion you are, or what your sexual preference or your gender, or any reason that we use to divide people into narrow little categories, no matter what those things happen to be, in America you are just like everybody else.

The poorest child in the ghetto under our law is entitled to the same accords under our law as is the President of the United States. If he is any better than anybody else, then those people 215 years ago were wrong. They did not intend to have a monarchy, and we do not have a monarchy, and we will never have a monarchy in this country.

The President of the United States has done us a disservice. He did America a disservice. He allowed someone to do him a disservice, because I know George Bush, and in his heart of hearts I know George Bush wants to do what is right. But he got bad advice from Boyden Gray and from John Sununu, and he vetoed a perfectly good, watered-down, halfway, do-nothing civil rights bill last year. It was not the bill that it ought to have been. It was not the bill it could have been. And it was not the bill that the founders of this Constitution would have been proud of.

We are talking about words that were written 215 years ago that are just as pertinent, just as viable, just as important as what is written tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are talking about the concept of ordered liberty, and in this country, black, white, brown, everybody is the same except sometimes when you find that the business interests, or some of the business interests who are most often misguided, because most of what is in title VII in the civil rights bill does not apply to small businesses anyway, because most small businesses, at least in my neck of the woods, have fewer than 15 employees, and people with fewer than 15 employees are not covered yet under the civil rights bill. That was one of the compromises that was made back in 1964.

My legal expert is here, and if I am wrong about the year, she will correct me. The original compromise was a higher number. I think it was 50 or more employees. She is nodding yes, so that Congress in its wisdom, or for the lack of it, compromised away a lot of people, the people who do most of the discriminating, the little mom-and-pop grocery stores and the small businesses. They were not covered then, and they are not covered now.

I will not spend any more time talking about what they do not do or what they do do, but I will talk about the procedure for getting into court to begin with. I will talk about the concept of equality for our people. I will talk about what is in the civil rights bill, what ought to be in the civil rights bill, and what ought not to be in the civil rights bill.

Now, the problem is that we watch television too much, and I realize that most of the people who are watching me are watching television right now, or otherwise they would not be seeing me, but we have allowed ourselves by these politicians to be—brainwashed is too strong a word; conditioned to the point that we make decisions about mayor and county commissioner and President and Congresspersons and elected officials principally based upon a 30-second sound bite. Someone can go and buy 30 seconds of television time, and they send a subliminal message with that. The people at the White House know that. Boyden Gray knew that last year. John Sununu knew that last year.

This is where the word "quotas" came from. That word was excised from a concurring opinion in *Wards Cove versus Atonio*. The word "quotas" first came up when the Supreme Court decided *Wards Cove versus Atonio*. It was a fallacious argument hypothetically made, and it was put in the middle of the concurring opinion by Justice White. That then has been extracted to become the watchword, because they want the people in the country to think that they are protecting them from these people who want to take away their rights.

The rights of all people are the same. I sure wish some of those who believe that this is a quota bill would come on over here, goodness to life, and give us an opportunity to discuss it.

□ 1840

If Members do not come today, when we stand up to talk about it tomorrow I will be here. If those Members will yield to me tomorrow, we will talk about it. I hope we will talk about it in an intelligent fashion because I believe that honesty and truth is the way that we talk about things in the Congress of the United States.

I would not stand here and call it just a quota bill unless I were able to back it up with an example. However, as everyone sees in the 30-second sound bite, Mr. Speaker, when it goes on the 6 o'clock news, they do not have to answer to that. All they have to do is call it a pig, and no matter what it looks or sounds like or purports to do, a lot of people will say, "Well, the President calls it a pig, so it must be a pig." Well, the President bought a pig in a poke this time because he cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, and he

cannot dress up what is a fundamental re-creation of rights that people have.

We are talking about *Patterson versus McLean Credit Union*, a case in which the Supreme Court so niggardly interpreted the law as to say the same law that the Congress passed in 1866, which by the way was enacted into law over the veto of the only other President in the history who vetoed a civil rights bill, was Andrew Johnson. Now, I know that President Bush does not want to go down in history with his name in the Guinness Book of World Records next to Andrew Johnson. In fact, he will be ahead of him this time because if he vetoes this civil rights bill, he will be the only President in the history of this country that ever vetoed two civil rights bills. Whichever version we send over, I am comfortable that the Congress will do its duty and pass a civil rights bill. It is a question of whether we want to pass an oatmeal civil rights bill or a lukewarm civil rights bill, or a civil rights bill that we can be proud of.

The substitute that is offered tomorrow by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in my judgment, is the more excellent way of the Congress forthrightly and honestly addressing the issue. Members of Congress can go home and look their constituents in the eye and say, "I was for civil rights, and I voted for civil rights." We do not have the right to go home and make a bunch of promises, and go to a bunch of chicken dinners, and smile at people, and pat them on the back and never look them in the eye like so many elected officials do. They expect something more from Members than that.

I did not come to Congress to stay forever. I came just to stay a little while.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of those who have spoken before me today.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for the role he has played in trying to produce a bill that would be credible, with a broad range of Members of this House.

I rise with the experience of having enforced the act under amendment at the height of its strength. It was my great privilege to enforce it at a time when it had bipartisan support, and I dare to believe it can attain that support once again.

This is an act that has literally transformed this country. At the time it was passed, both the people of color and women, literally, were confined to

a narrow band of occupations. Black men could be three or four things. White women could be five or six things. They were all compartmentalized by race and sex.

I am, therefore, offended that this great act would be amended in such a way as to drain its strength. It cannot possibly continue to do the work it has done for a quarter of a century if it no longer has the force and the power that characterized it for almost a quarter of a century, until the Supreme Court saw fit to tear up the bill and rewrite it. This Court, a conservative Court, presumably committed to the proposition that courts should let legislators write legislation.

First let me say a word about capping damages, a practice that is virtually unknown in this body and that should be stopped in its tracks. The notion of capping punitive damages, in particular, is a wasteful exercise. Anyone who reads the law or studies the law knows that punitive damages are rare in the law. A person can act with great negligence and disregard and still not qualify for punitive damages. I intend to insert in the RECORD tomorrow the sparse record of punitive damages under the job discrimination laws thus far.

The Republican substitute should not be dignified with the record caps however. It crushes damages. It not only caps them, it eliminates damages for all except one cause of action, sexual harassment, and that without regard to the fact that a person may not be fully compensated by \$150,000, especially since its actor presumably will live for some years, and \$150,000 in our economy gets to be less and less.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of quotas I had thought was put to rest in about 1978. It was raised during the time that I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Compensation Board and President Carter unequivocally came forward to make clear that quotas were no part of the way he understood any of the laws, and certainly not title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

We have here to undo, Mr. Speaker, three kinds of mischief: Mischief by the Supreme Court, mischief by the business community for the role it has played in this exercise, and finally, mischief by the President of the United States.

If I could ask the gentleman from Texas to let me just outline these three categories of mischief, I would be completed. First is the Supreme Court mischief, the outrage of a conservative Court rewriting a statute as the Court did in this case, taking the Griggs decision which it had originally interpreted so as to require the employer that his qualifications were job-related, to take that burden of more than 25 years and remove it from the employer, the only actor who knows the facts was nothing

more and nothing less than rewriting the statute and rewriting its own decisions, overturning, if you will, silently sub rosa the Griggs decision.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] say that he wanted to carry Members back to the Griggs decision. He wants to carry Members back to the Griggs decision, then of course he will do as we do and use the words of that decision: Manifest, substantial, significant, making the employers' burden related to the tasks that are done on the job.

We in this House seek to undo the Supreme Court's mischief, and I must say that this body is to be commended for reaching out to those against whom the act would be enforced. While we were not all pleased with the way in which this exercise was performed, the fact is that the business community sought out of this experience to save this bill by proposing some compromises.

I condemn the business community for its temerity in backing off from the exercise apparently after threats from the highest quarters in our country, agents of the President himself. It seems to me that the very reasons that the business community proceeded upon this exercise in the first place is understanding that minorities and women were the only supply of new workers, that white males were a diminishing supply, would be about 15 percent of the work force by the year 2000. Those reasons remain in force. Some of the proposals of the business community have found their way into one of the substitutes, in any case. However, I condemn the business community for disowning its own compromises. It has said it now wants the President's bill passed, disowning its own recommendations. That is temerity. That is cowardice. They should be called to account for it, and they should know that we know what they have done.

Finally, there is the greatest mischief of all, Mr. Speaker, and that is the mischief of the President of the United States himself. This President has, over the past several weeks, used his high office to divide and separate citizens on the basis of race.

□ 1850

The irony is, Mr. Speaker, that to the extent that he is concerned that numbers track an employer's compliance, it is not those who are of color who have benefited most. The largest supply of those who have experienced discrimination, of course, is white women. They are the mothers, the aunts, the daughters of Members of this body, and they have benefited mightily from this bill. Were it not for this bill, the standard of living of the American people would have plummeted, because at about the time the bill was passed the standard of living of

the United States family began to go down in no small part because our economy became less competitive. Women, therefore, flooded into the workplace. Had they not found jobs open to them through affirmative action and through this act, they would have been crowded into the five or six jobs that had always been women's jobs for the most part.

This bill then has rescued the American standard of living by opening job opportunities across the board, and yet the President has left the clear impression with the American people that this is a race bill. Whether he means to or not, the fact is that the President of the United States is being read as race baiting in this debate, and he owes the American people an apology. I invite him to cease and desist. I invite him even at this late hour to find a way to bring himself and his party to the hall-mark of Lincoln, for which I would rather his party be remembered than for the President's own acts these last few days.

The bills that are before us are in some respects not greatly different, but the rhetoric behind these bills has been greatly different.

As one who enforced this bill, saw it enforced without quotas, knows that whenever there was a cause of action by one such as a white man, that that person got redress under the act equally with people of color and women, understanding that this act has been enforced in such a way as to benefit all Americans, I call upon the President of the United States and his agents to join us finally in seeking a resolution that will give not only a bill that brings us together, but a bill that is worth having, a bill that strongly protects the right against job discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman from the District of Columbia providing us with these very eloquent remarks.

I hope that her dream can come true; however, the sad fact is that someone who would use the likes of a Willie Horton commercial to gain the Presidency of the United States is not likely to look with disfavor on what happened in South Carolina.

There was no mistake about it when that black hand came out and when the white hand got the pink slip, that is nothing but race. If this country is about which race votes for which person for President, we have not come very far at all. We are not that kind of people in this country.

One day the people of this country, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Indian people, who are not divided from each other are going to wake up and rise up. They are going to straighten out Democrats and Republicans who use

the worst form, the basest form of politics, to divide us one from another.

The office of the President is not worth having, it seems to me, it debases and defiles the office of the President to use the likes of turning one race against another in order to achieve that goal.

What do you accomplish? What do you win when you win the Presidency and you divide the people among themselves so that they hate each other, they fear each other, they dislike each other, they think that the reason I did not get the job is some mythical black person out there who is less qualified who did not pass a test, who is dumb, who is ignorant, who has gotten the benefit of some sort of race norm on some exam, those are the kinds of notions they put out there.

It is like throwing a skunk into a picnic. It does not matter whether it gets on anybody or not, but it sure does turn the party out.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Oregon.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me. It is an honor to engage in this debate before the House this week. Certainly as a member of the Judiciary Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights on which I have served with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, I want the folks in the gentleman's district to know what a great teacher he has been to this new Member from Oregon. It is truly one of my honors in my first term to serve with the gentleman and to learn firsthand from such a knowledgeable individual as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman honors me very much by his remarks.

Mr. KOPETSKI. You know, Mr. Speaker, we in Oregon have a strong tradition in this century of supporting civil rights laws, both Republican and Democratic Members in the House and in the Senate. One of the great champions of civil rights was the late Senator Wayne Morse from our State who helped in 1964 to pass that Civil Rights Act.

It has been a debate that I have listened to because I was not an original cosponsor of H.R. 1. I heard all these stories that, oh, it is a quota bill, and oh, we better be very careful with this kind of legislation. So I thought that I would go slow, that I would listen to the debate in the Civil Rights Subcommittee. I would read the testimony. I would examine the witnesses from both sides and think about it and reflect. It was only until after the bill went out of our subcommittee that I finally signed on as a cosponsor, because I was convinced at that point that we had a good product that we could take to the people of the United States and say this is a good product to move us

forward as a nation and that it is not a quota bill.

I was really amazed at the public relations gimmickry that has gone on around this bill, this whole notion that if you keep saying on the barnyard wall that this is a quota bill, this is a quota bill, the average Mr. and Mrs. America are going to think well, it must be a quota bill, because all these very important people are running around saying, well, we have got a quota bill and you better watch out. It is going to take your job away.

It is not a quota bill, but we are getting down to the real issue of what the folks are afraid of in this Chamber. I think it has everything to do with the sexual harassment provisions in title VII, that whether this Nation is going to put some teeth in enforcement language in title VII.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. That is the issue. They want to create this whole diversion and this whole smokescreen over here, talk about quotas, and appeal to the baser instincts of Americans to hide what is really going on, what we are really trying to achieve, and that is for a mechanism for the women of this country to finally have their day in court. I want to talk about that in a few minutes.

I want to talk first about the lawyers in our society, because I think tomorrow is going to be a field day in the sense of people coming up here and saying some not so very nice things about the legal profession, because one of the arguments Mr. and Mrs. America will hear against this is, "Oh, you're opening the courtroom door. The already flooded courts are going to be just deluged with all kinds of legislation as a result of this language."

□ 1900

Well, I thought it would be important to ask the witnesses of the subcommittee exactly what is going on out there beyond the beltway; not what we think is going on inside the beltway but what is going on inside the States.

I asked the attorneys on both sides, from a business perspective, those who practice and litigate in that area, as well as the civil rights attorneys who gave their time to come and address the congressional committee.

Well, what I found was an incredibly professional group of individuals who believe in their profession, who believe that almost all lawyers in this country are honest, that they are hard working; that clients come in and when a client comes in, they get the facts as any good lawyer does and he assesses whether there is a good case. They are not afraid to tell their clients, maybe in gentle language and maybe not, that they do not have a case, that, "You are wasting your time," being in their office.

"You may feel like you are being wronged, but legally you were not wronged and there is nothing you can do about it, at least in a court of law." Or they say, "Yes, you have a legitimate case, and this is what we are going to have to do to prove it, and this is how much time it is going to take and how much it is going to cost you." Other times they will go a step further and say, "Even if we can do this, you have to ask yourself, 'Is it worth it?' Is it worth it to you, to your family to go through all of this expense, time and stress, or do you want to move on in your life?"

All the attorneys who came before us say this happens in America, not just in these cases, but generally in all cases.

We can always know of the exceptions, we can always know of the bad attorneys out there.

I should say by way of disclaimer that, yes, I do have a law degree and I am proud of it, but I am not a member of any bar in the United States; I have never practiced law, I am not a lawyer, I do not consider myself a lawyer, but I do believe that lawyering and the legal profession is a very honorable profession. Also, we are pleased, we are pleased that we have a dedicated bar in this country and each of the States because we are a government of law. We are not a government of men or women or children, we are a government of law.

Sometimes the law gets very technical. So we ask the technician, we ask the mechanics of the law, the lawyers, to come help us out.

If you are ill, if you have a malady, you do not go to your real estate agent, you go to a doctor. If you have a legal problem, you do not go to your real estate agent, you go to your lawyer. That is the way it should be in this country.

So we should recognize it as a profession. Now, I went a step further and sometimes as a new Member you never know if you are crossing the line or not, but I asked one of these lawyers who came before us, who practiced civil rights law, I asked two further questions. I said, "Are you a millionaire?" I did. I asked them that. I did not ask how much money. I just wanted to know, "Are you a millionaire?" They all said "No." I said, "Are you going to become a millionaire if we pass H.R. 1?" Every one of them laughed and said, "No, we are not going to become millionaires if you pass H.R. 1." And I also asked "How many lawyers are there out there in your State that practice this kind of law?" And I was surprised at the answer. In the State of Texas, four or five attorneys practice civil rights law. That is it, four or five in a huge State like Texas. You would think there would be hundreds, but just four or five.

In the State of Virginia, not a large State by our standards, just three or four. My own State, one or two on any kind of a regular basis practices civil rights law.

So I hope my colleagues tomorrow do not get into the lawyer-bashing, do not make statements that this is going to be a full employment act for the attorneys, because the testimony in committees, the facts, say that it is not.

Well, I think I want to spend a little time also, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to talk about the victims, the victims of sexual harassment in this country, because I also took the time to ask and to explore the witnesses as they came before the committee, and ask them who are the people? It was surprising, surprising because I had expected the answer that it is going to be the new employee, the 18-, 20-, 22-year-old ladies, young ladies just entering the work force in this country. Not the case.

Usually, the profile is 40-, 45-year-old, 30-, 35-, 40-, 45-year-old lady, usually married, is highly embarrassed to walk into a law firm and say "I am being sexually harassed in the work force, and I need to do something about it." A very stressful situation, very distraught.

So they sat down, and I was surprised about that, that it goes on so much and that it is such a stressful aspect of an individual's life and it had been going on for a number of years. It was not something that started up last week or last month or in the last few months but had been going on, and the woman was afraid to talk to her husband about it, to talk to a family member about it.

And finally it got so bad that she did, and took a giant step. Under current law, and this is the problem that I want to talk about for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, under current law what the lawyer will say is, "Well, if you are successful, guess what we are going to do. We are going to make sure that you get your job back." You see, that is the relief, that is the damage award. When you win, you get to go back to that employment situation.

Now, if you think about it, the employment situation, the contract, if you will, before the employer and employee in this situation is destroyed. I am certain this woman and her family no longer respected that working atmosphere, that working environment. So what kind of relief is that? I say that it is not—it may be equitable in the lingo of the law, but for that person, for that family, that is not equity, that is not justice. That is not justice in our society.

So we are in a capitalism—a capitalistic atmosphere, which is great. So what is the reward of capitalism? It is money, it is money in our business society.

So that is what we are talking about, moving to this kind of system of jus-

tice, of getting payment for this stress, getting payment for this intolerable and outrageous situation. And, yes, if it is so bad and we want as a society to insure that it does not happen in other communities or in that community in other places, we are going to say, "You can get punitive damages."

Mr. Speaker, I would want to just read the standard for punitive damages. It is: Punitive damages are available only where there is an egregious violation, where there is malice or with reckless or callous indifference to the federally protected rights of others.

That is the standard we are talking about, where it is so onerous and outrageous that you say we cannot tolerate this and we want the society to know that we are not going to tolerate this whatsoever in our society. And the jury, the jury, a community of peers, is going to say, "Punitive damages."

You see, it is a very fundamental concept of a democracy, the jury system, which has worked for 200 years in the United States. It is a system that brings together, whether it is 6 in some States or up to 12 individuals for civil cases, although it can be 6, a representative sampling of the community and let them decide; not the Federal Congress, not the Federal Congress decide the value of a case or the upper limit of a case.

The \$150,000, that is what they are talking about tomorrow in terms of a limit, \$150,000, which does not exist for anybody else. But we may impose it for women. Or we are going to give you a new privilege: "Yes, you can get some monetary damages when you are wronged in the work force, but, you know, we are afraid, we are afraid of what is out there. So we are going to cap the damages, cap your award at \$150,000."

Well, I am very conservative in this respect. I believe that juries can come up with the right dollar amount for that particular situation.

As my distinguished new Member from the District of Columbia is going to enter into the RECORD, some statistics on those kinds of damages tomorrow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to talk just a moment about why you are seeing that I am one of the great supporters of Towns-Schroeder's substitute motion and although we see the bipartisan substitute that is going to be offered by Mr. BROOKS and Mr. FISH is not a bad piece of legislation, we are just saying that Towns-Schroeder is much better. It is a purer piece of legislation and clearly the Republican substitute is a step backward.

□ 1910

It is a step backward. It is going to require women to jump through some new procedural hoops just to get to the equitable relief that they already have under current law, under current law.

So, there will be some new barriers imposed.

Mr. Speaker, when we open our proceedings here in the Congress, we begin with the Pledge of Allegiance, and the words say, "and to the Republic for which it stands," and what does the Republic stand for? It begs the question and then immediately answers it. It says, "one Nation," one Nation, simple, but so profound; so profound because it does not have any exceptions. It does not say, "except for women," "only up to \$150,000 for damage awards." It says, "one Nation, under God." One Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I had a tremendous opportunity in our life to visit other nations in the fall of 1989. We were on our own, decided to go to Eastern Europe. We were in Budapest 2 days after Hungary became a Republic. We were in Poland after they found their freedom, fought for it, and we were in Czechoslovakia when it was still under Communist rule. Mr. Speaker, we were there when this tide of freedom was rolling through those countries and ultimately brought down the Berlin Wall itself.

We crossed into Czechoslovakia, and this border guard wanted to talk to us on his own. He was taking a risk. We probably were not so much. The worst they could probably do was throw us out of the country. But he put his job on the line probably at that time, and he picked us up in one town and took us to his home in another town, and we had a very nice evening with this gentleman. Essentially what he wanted to do was practice his English with some Americans and talk about America a little bit because, see, America still sets the standard in this world whether one is from Czechoslovakia, or from the Middle East, or from Africa, any country. When one talks about freedom, it is still the United States that sets the standard.

Mr. Speaker, we asked these countries to be free. We helped them out. There is a little bit of foreign aid. Maybe we even send in the CIA once in a while to help them out so that they can become free.

And we ask them to provide civil rights, civil rights to their own citizens, and we, we set that standard in the world.

And it gets more difficult. There is no doubt about it. As we get more and more people congested into these big cities back here, and in Los Angeles and in all these places, no doubt about it, putting all those people together, it gets more difficult. There is no frontier to which we can move.

As my colleagues know, before, if it got crowded in the East, then one moved to Iowa. Then it got clogged up in Iowa, and one would move out to Oregon or down to Los Angeles.

There are no more frontiers. We all have to live together, and we have to

make it work, and we should want to improve, improve the standard by which we live today. That is what I ask.

Mr. Speaker, the purest, best way tomorrow this Congress can set that new standard is to support the Towns-Schroeder substitute language.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], for those very wonderful remarks and for engaging in the dialog. I say to the gentleman, "You really put some nice thoughts together. The people out in your neck-of-the-woods, I'm sure, benefitted much from all of the wisdom and intelligence that you bring. But I would have loved to have seen you in the courtroom. I bet you would have been all right."

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just for a moment commend my new freshman colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI]. I am also a lawyer, and I am a very proud one, after hearing such a spirited and principled defense of our profession and an impassioned plea for what we ought to do tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I also would note the ironic tragedy that the eloquence of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], pointed out. It is about when we put our voting cards in the machine tomorrow; that our colleague from the District of Columbia can stand in this well, as we all stand in this well, as she did with such power and intensity this evening, but, when it comes time for us to decide which of these pieces of legislation, if any, will receive our support, she will not participate in that process. That is another issue for another day, but perhaps some of the underlying undercurrent that is holding us back or trying to hold us back from what we are going to achieve tomorrow speaks to that issue as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would thank and commend my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for opening up this forum, and I would note for the record that at the onset of his participation in this forum he invited those from any point of view who would raise any question about the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to come forward. It speaks volumes about the critics of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, that they are groundless allegations, that this is a quota bill which got made in the shrillness and in the glare of political debate, but in these unfortunate rare moments, when we can gather in this Chamber, and talk to each other, and engage in colloquy, and parse the facts and analyze the law, there is a

rather deafening silence from those to whom that challenge has been made.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] from another angle for what he has done today because I believe he is laying bare the real strategy of this debate from those who would try to stop the Civil Rights Act of 1991 from becoming law. Their participation in this debate is really less about what they are saying about this question, and it is more about the questions they do not want us to get into, and I thought about that today, Mr. Speaker, and over the weekend as I was back in my district in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I came across two of my constituents who talked to me about things that at first glance would seem unrelated to this debate. On Friday morning I spoke on the phone to a constituent who is a small businessman, a contractor, who goes about the business of remodeling homes, and remodeling small commercial facilities and building small commercial facilities, and I asked him, as I do many people, "How's business," and he said, "Business is lousy. It's worse than lousy." He said, "I've never been more frightened today than I have at any time in my life. I'm more frightened today than I've ever been in my life. I haven't had any work for 3½ months. My creditors are calling me and chasing me around. I am going to make a car payment this morning so my car won't be repossessed later in the day. I'm afraid I'm going to lose my house. I'm afraid I'm going to have to explain to my children why I can't give them what I've been able to give them in the past."

Mr. Speaker, this person is not someone who managed his money imprudently.

□ 1920

This is not someone who spent recklessly or ran his business into the ground. This is a solid, honest, hard-working American small businessman who is scared to death that for reasons that are beyond his control and beyond his comprehension he is going to lose everything he has. And he said to me, "What are they doing about it, and what are they saying about my problem in Washington, DC?"

I had to answer him, Mr. Speaker, "We're not really doing anything about your problem in Washington, DC."

This morning I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to tour an electronics assembly plant in Camden, NJ, in my district, and as we do, I walked along the line and shook hands with people and said, "Good morning" and introduced myself. There was one woman I encountered who wanted nothing to do with me or with any politician. Mr. Speaker, she said some words that I will not repeat here, acknowledging the decorum of this institution. She

wanted nothing to do with any politician because, she said, "Most of the people that used to work in this place are gone now. I'm still here only because there are a few of us left and I have some seniority. You're about 5 years too late, because most of the work that used to be done in places like Camden, NJ, is now done by people in the Philippines or done by people in Mexico, and I'm probably not going to have my job in a couple of weeks. So I don't really want to shake your hand and say, 'Good morning,' because I don't think any of you are addressing the kinds of things that ought to be addressed."

And I thought, Mr. Speaker, as we often do in that situation, what can I say to this woman? How can I convince her that I am trying to solve her problems and not just simply perpetuate them? What piece of legislation, what initiative could I point to and say, "We're trying to address your situation"? But I came up empty.

We understand why the debate in the national media in the last few weeks and the last few months has been dominated by the red herring of quotas. We understand that, Mr. Speaker. We understand that when you do not want to talk about why the pie is not getting bigger, you blame somebody else for taking your piece of the pie, and you explain to that small businessman in New Jersey or that woman working on that assembly line in New Jersey that the reason things are not very good for them right now and the reason they are justifiably fearful and angry that they may not get better is because some mythical member of a minority group that my friend, the gentleman from Texas, made reference to earlier, some mythical evil person is taking bread off your table.

So they say, "Don't blame the economic policymakers of this country who have exported our capital and given away our jobs and looked the other way as the industrial base of the country has crumbled. Don't blame the people who manage our Nation's fiscal resources with almost utter and reckless disregard to reinvesting in this country and making it grow again. Blame that person who is going to file a lawsuit and file a civil rights claim. Blame that person who is trying to force a quota down your throat. It's their fault."

Our colleague from the District of Columbia used the word apology. It was a good word to use. The deepest apology that ought to be made here is that at a time when there are fundamental economic questions that ought to be asked about where this country is going and fundamental economic questions that ought to be asked about why people have to work twice as hard just to stay in the same place, the powers that be in this country do not want to come to grips with that

question. So now they have the perfect opportunity not to, the perfect diversion, the perfect little bread-and-circus scenario to take people's minds off the issue. "It's that woman's fault, it's that minority's fault that this has happened."

I am not interested in fault, Mr. Speaker. I know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], and all the others who participated in this colloquy are not interested in fault. We are interested in growth. We are interested in healing the wounds that have plagued this country for generations, putting them aside and saying to everyone that the door is really and truly open to them regardless of gender, regardless of race, regardless of religion or national origin. We understand the door really is open to them, and now that we are healed, let us talk about how we can grow.

The administration not only fails to have an answer to that question, it does not want to come to grips with the question because it has no idea of when we should go.

I will make a prediction, Mr. Speaker: Regardless of the outcome of this legislation—and it is my fervent hope and my commitment to those who join me in support of this that I am going to work for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and, if necessary, for the bipartisan substitute; I am going to work for that—but regardless of the outcome of that, there will be another red herring. There will be another reason to focus on some external cause of our national problems so we do not have to look within.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, is not going to let us do that any more, and for that I commend him and all those who participated in this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] has expired.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I would at this particular time like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON], who has so eloquently preceded me in this Chamber this evening, to talk on the subject of civil rights. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to consume a few minutes of the gentleman's time, and then I will sit and listen to him. If we run out of things to say, let us think about it and talk about it a bit. I renew my collective request for any Members who are thinking about voting against the civil rights bill, who really want a civil rights bill, to come over this evening. We have another hour. We have a gentleman from Oregon, a gentleman from Maryland, a gentleman from New Jersey, and myself, who will be happy right here in front of God and everybody to answer whatever questions Members have about civil rights.

Again, thanking the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me, I would like to discuss very briefly the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS]. I used to practice criminal law when I was out there in the other world making a living. The gentleman touched on something that is just the old shell game. It used to be called the pigeon drop.

You take three half walnut shells and put them down and take the end off your eraser and put it under one, move them around, and you get the guy who is stupid enough to go for it to guess which one it is under. You bet a dollar, and if he does not guess which one it is under, he gives you a dollar, and then he does it again. But the point is that while he is moving them around, you take these two fingers right here and you take the eraser out from under there so it is not under any of them. That is the shell game we are talking about, and I think it is despicable.

We are not talking about right versus wrong, because everybody prefaces any remarks they make by saying, "I'm for civil rights, but I want it this way," or "I want it that way," or "I want it this other way."

This is not about who is right or who is wrong. I think the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] hit the nail on the head in his remarks. Principally, we have one idea that we put out here, and that is the lightning rod that draws all the lighting; that is the notion of quotas. Both the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New Jersey talked about that. But lurking in the background is the fact that we are dynamically undergoing changes in our work force, and in the not too distant future, hopefully in the lifetime of all of us here, in not too distant future the dynamics of our work force is going to dramatically change so that the majority of the people in the work force will be women, and they will go into the work force, as the gentleman from Oregon said, without some change in the law, and with scarce little protection, with probably less protection or actually less protection than black people had before the civil rights bill of 1964 was passed, because they

had the 1966 act which provided for damages under certain circumstances.

The business community understands all of this because they pay people who are experts in demographics. They know what the work force is going to look like in 2020, in 2010, in 2009, in 2008 and all those years, and they know exactly what colleges they are going to be going to and what elementary schools they are in now and what neighborhoods they are going to come from. So it seems to me they have a vested interest in ensuring that one of two things happens: That we level the playing field, to use a trite, overworked expression, or that we fool people into thinking that what is going on is not an attempt to level the playing field.

There is a whole lot more in the civil rights bill for women than there is for blacks and Hispanics or any other people who have been victimized. But that is not a reason for us who do not happen to be women to set ourselves apart from it. That is an opportunity for people like the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New Jersey, who love liberty, not just because we are lawyers but because we love liberty and we believe in the Constitution, we believe all people are equal, and we believe that women should have had the right to vote long before they passed the 16th amendment.

□ 1930

We believe in the 19th amendment. We believe in that. We know it was wrong, it was incomprehensible to think you could set up a society in which you did not allow women the right to vote and participate fully. But we have endured these things as a Nation, and it has made us stronger.

Benjamin Franklin said those who would surrender their freedom for temporary liberty deserved neither liberty nor freedom. They deserve neither liberty nor freedom.

Freedom is too precious to give away based upon whether someone is going to be President of the United States. It is too precious to give away based upon whether we like each other or not. Now is the time for the people who love this country to stand up and demand that we get our country back.

We were moving in the right direction years ago, and we hit a snag in the road. I am not talking about politics. We gave up on each other.

We got afraid because we got big cities and we see gangs of hoodlums running up and down the streets, that all of us despise. Where are their parents? Who is looking after them? Why were they not raised in the way we were raised? I am not talking about old-fashioned values, I am talking about new-fashioned values.

There is something about people that cuts across every line that is there. The people that believe in this country

want to move this country in the right direction. They do not want black communities and white communities.

You remember we had some testimony before the committee, a gentleman got up there and said that there are groups of people who want to be set apart. There is not a Member of Congress who ought to agree with that, even if they want to be set apart.

The difference between being a leader and being a politician is a leader knows what is right and does it, and a politician decides what the people think that they want, and tap dances on that.

I would rather be in Congress for 1 day and stand up and do what is right than be here for a lifetime and stand up for nothing. It is time for those who really believe in civil rights to stand up and say so. Not because of me. I have gotten all the civil rights I am going to have. You have gotten all the civil rights. We have all our civil rights, because God has given us an opportunity to do some things different in life, to represent other people. So will our children, and most of the people that we know and love.

We are not here in the well fighting for us. You are not fighting for the members of your family. You are fighting for people you have never met nor seen, because if they live in this country and stand on this soil, then they are entitled to the same thing when they go down to apply for a job. When the day comes that every other person walks through the door has an equal opportunity to get a job, then we will not need any more civil rights laws.

If you think we are there, then let us test it. If you know we have fallen short of our goal, then, as long as we need to pass civil rights bills, for Asians or for white males, for whom ever, I am not in favor of giving anybody an unfair advantage, I am in favor of giving everybody an equal opportunity.

It seems to me that incorporating the remarks made by my friends, both from New Jersey and Oregon, and the distinguished gentlewoman who will not be allowed to vote—you know, they fought a war about that. It was called taxation without representation. The people who threw the tea in the Boston Harbor were angry.

All that King of England had to do was give them some members in the Parliament, and this would still be a part of Great Britain, just like Canada, or just like Canada used to be.

Just think about that. These people live right here and they work for us, they work with us, they work around us, and they do not have the right to elect representatives to the Parliament. I am not suggesting that they have a Boston Tea Party. I am just thinking in passing.

But one day, the problem is, and I am going to sit down, the problem is unfortunately as human beings, some people

need to think that they are better than somebody else. Some people need that. Some people think that they need to feel that they are better than somebody else. They compare themselves. They say, I am younger than he is, I am better looking than he is, I am this race or that race.

We do not know what God looks like. God might be a black woman. If so, there are a whole lot of people that are going to be in a whole lot of trouble.

It does not matter, though. We are all God's children. As my friend from Oregon said, all these people around the world are looking at us.

We just got through fighting a war so that more people would look at us. We hold ourselves out and stand on the pedestal as exemplifying what freedom and equality really means.

I wonder how many times the Members come up here and just read the words that are etched into the base of the platform. One says "Union," one says "Justice," and one says "Tolerance." I do not know what the one over there on the Republican side says. I do not go over there too much.

But you think those words are just written there to be hollow, or do they really mean something? Is this our prayer?

Why do we have to pass a watered down civil rights bill, if civil rights is fair, if it is what this country was founded upon? How are we going to tell the people in Czechoslovakia, yes, we have freedom over here, but everybody is not free. Women are free to do certain things, but they are not free from discrimination in the workplace. People can make unwanted sexual advances toward women, regardless of their race, and we have a chance to do something about it. We knew it existed, and we had a chance to do something about it, and we did not do anything.

But we are the last of the law. This is the end of the line. I came from a State legislature where I could always put off problems on either the city council or the Congress. This is the end of the line, the buck stops here. If we do not do something about it, nobody is going to do anything about it.

The people out there want freedom. They do not want black people to have an unfair advantage, they do not want Hispanics or anybody else to have an unfair advantage. But you look at the polls. They want everybody to have the same opportunity. They need to know that right now this bill provides that a woman, in order to have a remedy, she has to quit her job or be fired, or put up with sexual harassment in America, in 1991, and that ain't right.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for yielding. If the occasion arises, I am going to sit here and listen to his eloquent statement, but, if there is enough time left, I

would like to share some more thoughts with you.

Mr. MFUME. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] again for his eloquence on this very special issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to quite a bit of the debate and discussion tonight, more discussion than debate, on the subject of civil rights. I would reiterate the call of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for those Members of Congress who have a differing opinion on this issue, to please come and join us now in this discussion, so that we might in fact have genuine and real and enlightened debate. It will not mean very much to many people tomorrow when those who seek to come and demagogue this issue run into this well for 30 seconds and quote all sorts of superlatives, and then run back to their seat and vote no on civil rights.

So for those Members of Congress who are in fact watching and listening tonight, we will be here, and we offer you the opportunity to come and debate the merits of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the real tragedies that calls our attention to this debate is the fact that there are so many people in this society who, through no fault of their own, find themselves deprived of basic civil rights.

□ 1940

I met a woman in Baltimore the other day who had just come back from the Persian Gulf. She is 21 years of age, left a daughter to go there, was there for almost 6 months, fought to defend the Government of Kuwait, watched some of her friends get wounded in the process, lost what little job she had back home that she did part time when she was not in the Reserves, lost 6 months of her daughter's life to serve her Nation and to answer the charge of the Commander in Chief to go and bear arms to defend the Government of Kuwait.

She asked in her own way, rather humble and yet defiant, she said, "Can you tell me, Congressman, how it is that I have gone and spent this time serving my country, halfway around the globe, to live on sand and to eat out of cans for 6 months, to go without any form or sense of entertainment, to work from can't see in the morning till can't see at night, to do my duty as a citizen and as a member of these Armed Forces, can you tell me why is it that I have to come back now to my daughter, who perhaps one day will have a daughter of her own, and to come back to my city of Baltimore and my country, the United States of America, and find now in 1991 that, after having gone and defended the civil rights and the civil liberties and to protect the Kuwaitis and their government, that I come back now without many civil rights of my own, with

one to sound the clarion call for me, with no one prepared to bear arms to defend and to protect my rights as a citizen of this country?"

She said, "How is it that fate would be so cruel?"

I had no reply.

That is the real irony in this debate and this discussion that has gone on too long. I served with the gentleman from Texas last year on the Committee on Education and Labor and was appointed, as he was, by the Speaker to serve as a conferee on the civil rights bill of 1990. We went into that conference hoping and really believing that this was going to be unlike other political meanderings around here, that this subject was so sacred to the fundamental rights of the Nation and of the Nation's conscience that there would not be any game playing on civil rights.

But as time began to go by and the first day turned into the second and the second turned into the third, there were clear indications that the White House and all who were a part of that house had no real intentions on moving a civil rights bill. And those who were in the President's most sacred and inner circle began to suggest to him that whatever the Congress came up with, he ought to veto because it in some way was meant to construe or to suggest the implementation of quotas.

Day 3 turned into day 4, and the White House, understanding that it had no intentions of signing that bill, began to play with those of us who were part of the conference. And they would send a messenger up here to Capitol Hill and say, "The President would like to sign the bill, but we think you ought to change this provision."

And because we all wanted to be responsible and play evenhandedly with the President and the White House, after having gone through a rather hand-wrenching and heart-wrenching experience in committee and in conference, we agreed and we worked with the White House to the extent that we met them on the road with that compromise and we made it a part of the conference report.

And day 5 turned into day 6 and into day 7, and the White House called again and said, "Well, you know, the President really would like to sign a civil rights bill, but we would appreciate it if you would change this provision because he doesn't like it and we don't think it is right."

And there was more resistance building in the conference committee because we had gone out and we had met him on the road once, and we were waiting, quite frankly, for the President to meet us. But after hours of debate and discussions and all sorts of considerations, we moved again to seek to compromise to meet the President halfway. And day 8 turned into day 9.

Finally, with this talk of quotas, there came another call from the White House that said, "Well, you know, we think this is a quota bill and we cannot support it, but the President would love to sign the civil rights bill if you would just change the language."

And so the conferees got together and put in the preamble of the bill the fact that it was not to be construed as a quota bill, that there were not requirements to make it a quota bill. It was not my language. It was not the language of the gentleman from Texas. It was the language of the White House verbatim. And we put that into the bill. We met the President again on the road halfway for the third time.

And 1 week turned into 2 weeks, and we came before this body, under the leadership of GUS HAWKINS and through a rather long and interesting debate, this House finally had a chance to work its will. And there was legitimate dispute on both sides of the issue, and there were amendments to the bill. And people wanted to amend the conference report, but the House worked its will and Representatives from all over this Nation, who represent every nook and cranny, every hamlet, every town, and every city had a chance at long last to vote on a civil rights bill.

So we on the third week sent that bill down to the White House. We had compromised. We had been responsible, we thought. And we were in great anticipation that the President would, in fact, do what he said he would do when he sent compromise after compromise to Capitol Hill.

Well, what the President did was to carve himself a rather infamous place in the history of this Nation by becoming only the second President in this century to veto a civil rights bill. The President's decision was ill-conceived and the President was ill-advised. And that day of infamy is in many respects the worst day of his Presidency.

The Senate, where the bill originated, the other body convened to work its will and to seek to override. And on October 24, 1990, with David Dukes, former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan in the Gallery of the Senate, the other body failed by one vote, one vote to override the veto of this President. They voted to sustain it. And for the other body, that was the darkest day of the 101st Congress.

So we got to this point not by accident. We do not come here this evening for forum or fashion. We recognize that there is an evil and a sinister wind blowing down on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I said on the evening of October 24 that I gave President Bush the benefit of the doubt, that I believed in my heart and in the innermost parts of my being that he really wanted to do the right thing. I conceded to him the benefit of the doubt.

□ 1950

Mr. Speaker, I believed that the President, on his second chance, would, in fact, do the right thing. So the sadness in my heart this evening, for all of you around this country watching this discussion, is not because there are persons advising the President who may be sinister as it relates to civil rights, it is not because there is a body of misinformation and disinformation that is swelling all across this Nation in newspaper headlines and on the TV channels, because none of that really matters. The sadness is the fact that this President, who knows better, continues to argue, erroneously so, that this is a quota bill. Shame on you, Mr. President. You know better. And I know you know better.

I defy anyone in the White House to come to this body and to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the bill we have before us is, in fact, a quota bill. I defy you. And I know you are watching this debate, all of you who have advised the President, all of you who, in your own way, recognize not the virtue of the merits of the bill but who recognize the political capital if you can continue to confuse and divide and separate the public by having them believe that women and persons of African and Hispanic ancestry are going to somehow benefit at the detriment of others. Shame on you. You know better. I know you know better.

And so we are back in many respects to the shell game that the gentleman from Texas spoke about earlier. It is also a media game. It is the old confusion about who is on first. We have to come to this point in our time as a nation visiting this very serious issue, because we have not learned the lesson of Lincoln, who reminded us that a house divided against itself cannot stand, because we have not learned the lesson of Martin Luther King, who reminded us that we are confronted with the fierce urgency of now, and that in this unfolding conundrum of life and history that there really is such a thing as being too late, and that procrastination is still the great thief of time.

We are here because too often philosophically and ideologically we are stilled and stymied and stultified by those in our number who pontificate but do not produce, by those who confuse the issues but will not clarify, by those who seek but will not serve, and by those who harm and ruin the preservation of our rich history and culture as a nation by refusing to hang onto the basic lessons of it, yet we must be the ones, those here and all of you who are at home who close the gap between what we really say and between what we really do, we must not only lecture by example, we must set examples.

We must be prepared to reject the nonsense, the propaganda that has surrounded this issue by cutting through

it in a clear and concise way with what the facts are. Civil rights.

You know, in 1848 in a speech delivered in Edwardsville, IL, Abraham Lincoln addressed these words to his countrymen, and he said, "When you have succeeded in dehumanizing the Negro, when you have put him down and made it but for him to be but as a beast of the field, when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demons you have roused will not turn and rend you? What constitutes," he asks, "the bulwark of our freedom and of our independence? It is not our crown embattlements. It is not our bristling sea-coast, or armies or our navies. They are not our reliance against tyranny," said Lincoln. "For all of those may be turned against us without having made us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance," he said, "is in the spirit of freedom which prides itself as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy that spirit," he admonished, "and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doorstep. Ignore," he said, "the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them; accustom to trample on the rights of others, and you have lost, my fellow countrymen, the creative genius of your own independence, and as such become the fit subjects for the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Lincoln's words, uttered over 143 years ago, have gone unheeded. Poverty, despair, hunger, homelessness, degradation, deprivation, denial and disprivilege are still a part of the American fabric in the greatest nation on Earth.

You know, someone came to me and said, "Congressman, you did not answer that woman's question. She said that she had left her daughter and her own family and her part-time job and had gone over to silently sit in the sands of Saudi Arabia and that she was there for 6 months and that in that period of time she had to real recreation, she worked from 'Can't see in the morning to can't see at night,' and she was prepared to defend and to protect the sovereignty and the civil rights and the human rights of Kuwaitis, and you did not answer her question, Congressman. She wanted to know why is it that she would come back here 6 months later in the greatest nation on Earth after having protected the civil rights of Kuwaitis, with no civil rights of her own or for her daughter or her daughter's daughter. You did not answer her question."

I do not know, quite frankly, what else African-ancestry or Hispanic-ancestry Americans must do to exhibit their faith in the American dream or in the American possibility. Our fathers and brothers have answered every call to bear arms, to defend liberties that

we never really had. The bodies of black and Hispanic men are buried around the globe in the soil of every nation as witness and testimony to preserving a democracy that they never fully enjoyed.

Our parents have begged on bended knees to be accorded the most elementary of human rights. We have peacefully assembled and petitioned for the redress of our grievances. We sat in, stood in, slept in, studied in, and prayed in. We have waged our struggle as Martin Luther King taught, non-violently. We have appealed to the Nation's morality and to the Nation's conscience.

The result, too often, has been bloodied heads and broken limbs, bombed churches and burned homes, assassinated leaders and murdered followers, broken spirits and crippled hopes.

And so when I say we did not come here accidentally tonight to arrive at this point, understand that we did not, and when we challenge, as we do, those Members of this House who will argue that the civil rights bill is no more than a quota bill, to come here tonight and to defend that twisted position, we do not do it out of some twisted desire to have competition. We believe that a spirited debate, an intellectual debate on the real issues and substance of this bill will yield unto all of the American people who are watching the debate the understanding that the civil rights bill is as American as apple pie.

□ 2000

That the protections afforded to women and minorities are basic protections. They were not guaranteed with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. They were guaranteed when the Founding Fathers got together and wrote the Preamble to the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and all the other pronouncements that they issued, to justify their revolution against tyranny. That is why we are here, and that is why we challenge those who will dispute the necessity of this great bill, the need of this bill, and the protection of all those women and all those minorities in this country, not to have something special.

We are not seeking an edge up. We do not want any guarantees. We do not want any person to give anything to women or to minorities. We just want an even playing field, because we believe it is the American thing to do.

Tomorrow, many citizens all across this Nation, and some citizens across this world will watch almost 8 hours of debate on the bill and on amendments to the bill. The citizens will see during that debate a number of our colleagues come and argue that this bill is now somehow bad. Remember to challenge them when they come back to your hometown. Remember to challenge them. Have those Members prove it. Dare to defy the authority that they

represent. Make them understand that voting against this bill does not move this Nation forward. It moves this Nation back.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield once again to my friend and colleague from the State of Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] as we prepare to wrap up discussion on the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I was a lawyer I learned a couple of things. One of them, do not ever ask one question too many; and I think with that, do not make one statement too many. There is nothing I can probably say that could improve upon the statement that the gentleman has made on behalf of and in defense of civil rights, on this occasion. However, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy before we shut down.

Does the gentleman think that the people who care about this issue, if they are watching tonight, or if they are watching their television sets tomorrow, does the gentleman in the well think they would be interested in something like the truth?

Mr. MFUME. I think they would be very interested in the truth. The tragedy of it all is that many have been given lies dressed up as the truth in such a way that it is hard to discern which way is up and which way is down, which way is in and which way is out in this bill, and that those who have made the decision to watch this debate this evening in their homes probably thirst for the truth. That is why they are watching.

The other tragedy is that they have not had the opportunity to hear the other side of the debate. We have issued a challenge. The challenge has gone unheard. I think and I believe in my heart that people across this Nation, Americans, are held together by a common bond and a common thread. That is the understanding that we are only as good as our neighbors. We can only rise as high as our friends. We are only as trustworthy as our families, and that we who have this awesome privilege to serve in this House, that we owe them the truth, if we owe them nothing else.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Does the gentleman think that someone who would be interested in the position, say, one who would say that this a quota bill, should, then, before the American public, because I think that fundamentally probably 80 to 90 percent of the people in this country would be happy if we had a system that was completely fair. They do not want one group to have an advantage over another. We have gone through civil rights in the 1950's and the 1960's, but by 1991 I dare say if we took a referendum on it in the country, probably 85 to 90 percent of the people on the straight-up question, do you think we should have laws that guarantee an equal opportunity to every per-

son in the workplace, would probably agree with that, and they are troubled by this notion about quotas, as the gentleman has so eloquently talked about.

If I were a citizen at home, and I were watching my Congressman or Congresswoman up tomorrow during debate, and they kept using the word "quota," there are some people who think they can brainwash people by saying something over and over again, long enough, putting it in all your speeches, and they get up and talk about the sky being pink, and suddenly it will have a certain shade of pink. It is the power of suggestion which is powerful, especially when people look to Members, because we have been elected to public office.

This podium can be used for good or evil. Sometimes people use it, in my judgment, improperly. However, suppose that they see their Members of Congress up here saying that it is a quota bill, but not saying why. Does the gentleman think of those people, because really the explanation is for them. The explanation the gentleman in the well is giving now, for why he will vote for the bill, is for his constituents. It is to explain it to the larger world what is right and what is wrong as the gentleman sees it. It seems to me that if they call area code 202, 224-3124, which is the Capitol switchboard—I cannot give out Members' offices anymore. I did that last year and I got in trouble. However, I think it is still legal under the rules to advise the people on whose behalf we are here that they have a way of addressing their thoughts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not in order to direct remarks in debate primarily to a television viewing audience.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I thank the Speaker. My question was a question perhaps the Speaker misunderstood.

I will ask the gentleman, if a constituent were to call area code 202, 224-3121, they would get the Capitol switchboard, would they not?

Mr. MFUME. That is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If the citizens live in Congressman WASHINGTON's district, they could ask the switchboard to connect them with my office?

Mr. MFUME. That is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. So, if I got up here and I said that this bill did thus and so and I never attempt to prove how it did thus and so and they arrive at the conclusion I was giving a political answer, in other words, not telling them the truth, they could contact my office in that way, and perhaps persuade me if enough of them called, if they could talk to me personally, they may be able to change my vote on this bill tomorrow?

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct, and I would go a step farther to argue that in asking that of their particular Representative, it would also be good to ask them to prove that it is a quota bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Just giving an example, they started out saying it was a quota bill, and said it was really not a quota bill, but will lead to quotas. Any person who is elected to public office ought to be intelligent enough to make a hypothetical question to bear that out. In my judgment, any person who is intelligent enough to be elected to the United States House of Representatives, ought to be able to say here is a hypothetical situation, XYZ Employment Co., John Jones comes to apply for a job. He takes the test, he does this. The problem is, they cannot do that. It is impossible. They have not done it since they branded the bill in 1990 a "quota" bill. From that day to this John Sununu or any of the rest of them have not been able to articulate in a clear, hypothetical example, even this is how this will yield quotas. Quotas mean x number of jobs go to white people, x number of jobs go to black people. If we had to vote on whether we were going to integrate the schools, they would say that was quotas because that means instead of having all black kids in one school and all white kids in another school, they put the schools together, so that would be a quota to them, would it not?

Mr. MFUME. I believe the gentleman is correct, and interestingly enough, the three substitutes that we will have an opportunity to vote on tomorrow, H.R. 1 as substituted by Towns and Schroeder state, "That nothing in the bill shall be construed to require or to encourage an employer to adopt hiring or promotional quotas."

□ 2010

The other substitute, the Brooks-Fish substitute, explicitly prohibits the use of quotas by employers, stipulating that the use of quotas is an unlawful employment practice; but interestingly enough, this bill I have here from the White House, this same White House that makes this quota argument, has absolutely no language and no provisions relating to quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. What?

Mr. MFUME. The quota bill is the White House bill, and I challenge them to come here to prove me wrong. There is nothing in their bill that prohibits quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Surely the gentleman has misread the bill. Somewhere down in there must be a first-degree felony. I mean, if you want to prohibit quotas, make it a crime. Surely the White House version says a person who hires based upon racial quotas shall go to the penitentiary for life. It is in there somewhere. It has got to be.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is incorrect. The White House civil rights bill makes no provisions to outlaw or make unlawful quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, will the gentleman explain to me then if the White House bill does not prohibit quotas, if we were to pass the White House bill and the bill last year was going to result in quotas, would not the White House bill result in quotas?

Mr. MFUME. The White House bill would result in quotas even quicker.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Because there is no prohibition against quotas, so really it encourages quotas.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is that what you call speaking with a forked tongue?

Mr. MFUME. Either that or the old shell game.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Either one of which means that the people lose again.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct, and that is why it is so very important for individuals across this Nation who are watching this discussion to really look at what we are dealing with and to read for themselves or to challenge their Member of Congress to make this information available.

The gentleman from Texas and I were going back in a rather friendly way to talk about the absolute omission of quota language in the White House bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is the truth. It does not exist in the bill that the White House has called its "civil rights alternative," but it does exist. Not only does it prohibit it, it makes it unlawful in the civil rights bill that this body will have a chance to vote on tomorrow.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let me ask the gentleman from Maryland a question, if he will yield further.

In today's New York Times on page A-14 there was an objective evenhanded analysis of everything that touches every Member, and the people out there in the world will not have an opportunity to read what the gentleman from Maryland has in his hand, but they can read the newspapers. I dare say in every major newspaper there is an outline of the three major proposals that the Congress will have to vote on tomorrow. So it seems to me this is an opportunity for the people to have a chance to have their voices heard. If they think that the quota substitute is best, then call their Member of Congress and tell them so. If they think that the White House version, which will produce quotas, is the best way, then they ought to tell their Congressman and tell them that; but in the newspaper, the New York Times, page A-14, today's paper, there is an excellent side-by-side, if you will, comparison that addresses it as far as impact, it addresses quotas, it addresses discrimination and harassment, the re-

opening of old discrimination cases and adjustment of employment tests.

Does the gentleman think this would be good reading for the people out there before they call their Member of Congress?

Mr. MFUME. I think the gentleman makes a point that is worth repeating. It would make excellent reading, particularly given the importance historically and otherwise of this legislation.

Mr. WASHINGTON. May I ask the gentleman one final thing. Will the gentleman be here tomorrow for the purpose of guarding and protecting the people's rights with that Diogenes lamp that the gentleman so often carries around? Will the gentleman be here to ensure that the truth comes out when people get up on this side of the aisle or on that side of the aisle and use the word "quotas," will the gentleman be here to ask them to yield so that they will tell the truth for the American people one time on one day? And if they do not yield, what does that say?

If I get up here and say that I have a watermelon in my pocket and I will not yield to you to ask me any questions about it and my pockets are not fat, the people can figure that out for themselves, can they not?

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the colloquy.

Let me just say that we have been here for several hours this evening to try to argue the merits of the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Quite frankly, I am a bit disappointed that the critics of that bill have not chosen to come and to be a part of this discussion.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They never showed up?

Mr. MFUME. They never showed. However, be that as it may, those all across this Nation who understand and feel in their hearts why this is important and perhaps those all across this Nation who wonder what in the world should I be interested in this bill about, please understand that what we are dealing with is not just a piece of legislation. We are getting ready to write for all intents and purposes the direction of our great Nation on the issue of civil rights for a very, very long time to come.

I have not given up on the American ideal or on the American possibility, and I ask all of you not to give up also.

I am convinced that this Nation still stands before the world as perhaps the last expression of a possibility of man devising a social order where justice is the supreme ruler and law is but its instrument, where freedom is the dominant creed and order, but it is principle, where equity is the common

practice and fraternity the common human condition.

It is also my conviction that we might be the last generation of Americans that has the real opportunity to help our Nation fulfill its promise and to realize its possibility.

Our generation may be the last generation to be afforded another chance, another chance to balance the scales of justice and make them equal, another chance to confront the doors of opportunity and make them open, another chance to seize the chains of bondage and set and break them free.

So if we have not done anything else tonight, we have come to you as only we know how in this humble and sincere way to say, understand the magnitude of what will occur here tomorrow.

Oh, few will remember what we say tomorrow, but all will remember what we do, and that is why it is so vital, so extremely urgent and necessary that we move for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and that this President, who is our President, understands that to be the President of all the people you must understand that the protection of the rights of all the people is in fact paramount and that fairness ought to be the measure by which we go about dissecting and analyzing this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, 215 years ago the Founding Fathers of this Nation made an initial commitment to the concept of equality in the words of the Declaration of Independence. This hallowed document affirmed that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

For almost a century following, the fulfillment of that concept of equality was restricted, with few exceptions, only to white males who were not Catholics or Jews. However, with the advent of Jacksonian democracy and new generations of immigrants, people of conscience began to question the oppression, intolerance, bigotry, and economic elitism that precluded inclusion of all America's inhabitants in the promise of American life—the right to be free citizens with equal opportunity for all—regardless of race, creed, gender, national origin, or political preference.

One hundred thirty years ago this Nation entered into one of the bloodiest civil wars in any nation's history—for the ultimate goals of ending the obscenity of slavery and expanding the frontiers of freedom for all of America's minorities. The passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 1870, and 1875 guaranteed political freedom and economic equality not only for blacks—but also for Jews, Catholics, Hispanics, Asians, Eastern Europeans—and ultimately, for all women, because these laws also made possible the subsequent passage of the 19th amendment, which guaranteed the electoral franchise for all women.

However, a century later, the minorities and women of this country were still striving to obtain their rightful place at the table of equal

opportunity. Thousands had been murdered and millions deprived of their fundamental rights in the collective crusade for social and economic justice. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., pleaded on their behalf in his famous speech at the Lincoln Memorial on 28 August 1963:

We have come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, Black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Dr. King went on to say:

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."

But Dr. King then went on to espouse our most cherished desire, saying:

I have a dream that my four little children [including two girls] will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

The subsequent passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968 were landmark laws in the struggle for equal justice and opportunity. One can only conjecture how much grief this Nation—and this Congress—would have been spared if all the laws cited above had been fully and fairly implemented—with justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic, harsh reality is that we are here today because those laws have not been fully and fairly implemented during the past decade.

The bill before us tomorrow is a legislative effort to undo the injustices inflicted upon American justice brought on by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1989. It is an effort to return this Congress and the Federal courts to the integrity and intent of the legislation that was enacted in 1964—legislation that deliberately designed to ensure equality of opportunity in the workplace for women, minorities, and the physically disadvantaged throughout this land.

Mr. Speaker, it is a national shame that, in the year 1991 A.D. we even need to be here in this hall again attempting to undo this injustice.

Five months ago the leadership of this House made a priority commitment to the cause of gender and racial justice by designating this legislation as H.R. 1. I applaud the focus and efforts of the leadership. However, in the months since, I have become increasingly dismayed as I have watched the effects of the negotiations which were perceived to be necessary in order to allay the fears of those who felt that H.R. 1 is a quota bill. I am also saddened by such compromises as making the monetary compensatory damages for women and religious minorities less than for

the minorities who succeed in winning discrimination suits in the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Towns-Schroeder substitute to H.R. 1. It is not an attempt to break new ground, but rather to restore the even playing field that has been deliberately tilted against minorities and women in recent years. It is an effort to force this Congress and the country at large to live up to the professed ideals that still make America the land of promise for so many who strive for true freedom and equality of opportunity in this society.

The time to end the politicization of this issue is way overdue. Those who look to the thirty-second campaign ads as the ultimate goal of their civil rights agenda must rise above the distortions and the rhetoric to a new plane: A civil rights bill that recognizes we are all created equal—we must all be given the tools to fairly pursue life, liberty, and happiness.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SNOWE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of her accompanying members of the Base Closure Commission to a site visit at Loring Air Force Base in Maine.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOUCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZZO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. STUDDS, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, on June 11.

Mr. RUSSO, for 60 minutes each day, on June 5 and 6.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. BORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. PURSELL.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOUCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 31, 1991:

H.R. 2127. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend the programs of such act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1425. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1426. A letter from the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the effects of the fiscal year 1991-97 Navy shipbuilding and repair programs on U.S. private shipyards and the supporting industrial base for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the SD-8A and SD-8B Dragon antitank missile warheads, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed hardware license and technical assistance agreement for support of the ASTRA 1C and 1D Commercial Communications Satellite Program, which is between Hughes Communications International Inc., and the Societe Europeenne des Satellites de Luxembourg (Transmittal No. 36-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1429. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on developments since his last report of November 29, 1990, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) (H. Doc. No. 102-98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting an invitation from the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Republic of Moldova to attend a June conference in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1431. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a public report made to the President entitled "Public Diplomacy in a New Europe"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1432. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the annual report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1433. A letter from the Director, ACTION, transmitting the two semiannual reports covering the 6-month period ending March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1434. A letter from the Chairman, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1435. A letter from the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1990, for the Production Credit Associations Retirement Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1436. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report for the period October 1, 1990 to March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1437. A letter from the Acting Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the semiannual report for the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1440. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3903 (102 Stat. 2531); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1441. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act (33 U.S.C. 1203); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1442. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation to establish conditions for personnel with specialized skills to be deployed overseas without completing a 12-week training period; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1443. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting a report on the budgetary treatment of deposit insurance, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1003(b) (103 Stat. 509); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

1444. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the second of two reports on global climate change entitled "Policy Options for Stabilizing Global Climate"; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

1445. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on government-sponsored enterprises (GAO/GGO-91-90, May 1991), pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1004(e) (103 Stat. 510); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, and Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-57, Pt. 2) Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-83). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 476. A bill to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 990. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield, MD; with an amendment (Rept. 102-85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1642. A bill to establish in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1323. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain segments of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 292. An act to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument (Rept. 102-88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1514. A bill to disclaim or relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands conditionally relinquished to the United States under the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-89, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. S. 483. An act entitled the "Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991" (Rept. 102-90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Saint Elizabeths Hospital and District of Columbia Mental Health Services Act to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an agreement with the Mayor of the District of Columbia with respect to capital improvements necessary for the delivery of mental health services in the District, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-

91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2123. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to establish a predictable and equitable method for determining the amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia (Rept. 102-92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRAXLER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2519. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2474. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than June 5, 1991, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(c), Rule X (Rept. 102-93, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X:

H.R. 2038. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than June 5, 1991.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey):

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for

fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

H.R. 2509. A bill to provide for a resumption of the gold standard; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. FAWELL):

H.R. 2510. A bill to deny nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) trade treatment to the products of India; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 2511. A bill to prohibit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve, and other Government agencies from providing any form of direct or indirect assistance to cover foreign deposits; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2512. A bill to encourage informed compliance, implement the National Customs Automation Program, and otherwise improve the administration of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 2513. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project under which Medicare beneficiaries may enter into agreements with suppliers of certain items of durable medical equipment to obtain items other than the standard version of the items for which payment may be made under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself and Mr. AUCOIN):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to extend the requirement for reciprocity in the approval of housing subdivisions; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HORN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to gross vehicle weights on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and title 49, United States Code with respect to commercial motor vehicle combination lengths, on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and other highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2516. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain facilities in the Wenatchee National Forest, WA; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FIELDS):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an inter-agency program for trauma research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of 1994 and later model year passenger vehicles that are equipped with air bags, and to impose an excise tax on such vehicles that are not equipped with air bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOEHLETT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FALOMAVAGA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. LONG, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VOLKMER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American public should observe the 100th anniversary of moviemaking and recognize the contributions of the American Film Institute in advocating and preserving the art of film; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs.

MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 163. Resolution condemning violence in Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

154. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to support for the Baltic Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the POW/MIA special investigation conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; to the Committee on Government Operations.

156. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the POW/MIA truth bill; to the Committee on Government Operations.

157. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to American service personnel missing in action; to the Committee on Government Operations.

158. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Social Security funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the low-income home energy assistance program; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

160. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the new Canadian permit regulations; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

161. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 20: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 25: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Ms. HORN, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 44: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 66: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 147: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 187: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 317: Mr. HUCKABY and Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 330: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 392: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COX of Illinois, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 413: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 416: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 430: Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 565: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 644: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 661: Mr. INHOPE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 670: Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 676: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 714: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 722: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 723: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 780: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 905: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 911: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LENT, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 967: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1110: Mr. TORRES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1126: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. REED, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1130: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1132: Mr. CLAY and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1133: Mr. ECKART, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1134: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1147: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. FISH, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1218: Mr. RAY, Mr. FISH, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1226: Mr. FISH and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1241: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PORTER and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 1242: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1245: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FISH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1293: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1304: Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 1305: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 1335: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1343: Mr. NAGLE and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1364: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1365: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1367: Mr. SABO and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1380: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1385: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1392: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1411: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ROE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1433: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1445: Mr. CAMP and Mr. INHOPE.

H.R. 1456: Mr. HYDE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 1472: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 1481: Mr. RITTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KYL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MORRISON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1497: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1506: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1509: Mr. PRICE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. APLEGATE.

H.R. 1554: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1557: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 1603: Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1696: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1703: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1711: Mrs. BRYON.

H.R. 1724: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1752: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1816: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FISH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 1879: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1883: Mr. LUKE and Mr. APLEGATE.

H.R. 1916: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 1936: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1967: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1992: Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2001: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2008: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 2031: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2056: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2081: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2089: Mr. MFUME and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2099: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FISH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2115: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2123: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr.

DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2126: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2194: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 2235: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 2242: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. YATES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DeLauro, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2248: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2257: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. KYL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. INHOPE.

H.R. 2258: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2280: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WYLIE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HEFFNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2294: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2327: Mr. PARKER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2330: Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 2336: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2389: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2397: Mr. PETRI, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 2405: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2406: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2448: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2454: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 2456: Mr. YATES and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. RHODES, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 66: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. REED, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr.

RINALDO, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 156: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. KASICH, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FISH, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.J. Res. 219: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MOODY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. McEwen, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. YATES, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. LONG, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.J. Res. 233: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 262: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. ROTH.

H. Con. Res. 93: Mr. MORAN.

H. Con. Res. 103: Mr. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. HORTON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FROST, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 115: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H. Res. 121: Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Res. 134: Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 141: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Res. 152: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RIGGS.

H. Res. 155: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BONIOR.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Federal Parliament of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, relative to changes in Central and Eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. Also, petition of the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization, Clearwater, FL, relative to the Federal gas tax revenue for nontransportation purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.